A threshold approach to connected domination*

Nina Chiarelli
University of Primorska, UP FAMNIT, Glagoljaška 8, SI6000 Koper, Slovenia
University of Primorska, UP IAM, Muzejski trg 2, SI6000 Koper, Slovenia
nina.chiarelli@famnit.upr.si

Martin Milanič
University of Primorska, UP IAM, Muzejski trg 2, SI6000 Koper, Slovenia
University of Primorska, UP FAMNIT, Glagoljaška 8, SI6000 Koper, Slovenia
martin.milanic@upr.si

October 21, 2016

arXiv:1610.06539v1 [math.CO] 20 Oct 2016

Abstract

A connected dominating set in a graph is a dominating set of vertices that induces a connected subgraph. We introduce and study the *connected-domishold graphs*, defined as graphs that admit non-negative real weights associated to their vertices such that a set of vertices is a connected dominating set if and only if the sum of the corresponding weights exceeds a certain threshold.

More specifically, we show that connected-domishold graphs form a non-hereditary class of graphs properly containing two well known classes of chordal graphs: the block graphs and the trivially perfect graphs. We characterize connected-domishold graphs in terms of thresholdness of their minimal separator hypergraphs and show, conversely, that connected-domishold split graphs can be used to characterize threshold hypergraphs. Graphs every connected induced subgraph of which is connected-domishold are characterized in terms of forbidden induced subgraphs and in terms of properties of the minimal separator hypergraph. As a side result, our approach leads to new polynomially solvable cases of the minimum-weight connected domination problem.

Keywords: connected dominating set; connected domination; connected-domishold graph; forbidden induced subgraph characterization; split graph; chordal graph; 1-Sperner hypergraph; threshold hypergraph; threshold Boolean function

Math. Subj. Class. (2010): 05C69; 05C75; 05C65

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Threshold concepts have been a subject of investigation for various discrete structures, including graphs [16,19,44], Boolean functions [18,21,28,31,49,51], and hypergraphs [33,54]. A common theme of these studies is to understand necessary and sufficient conditions so that a given combinatorial structure defined over some finite ground set U admits non-negative real weights associated to elements of U such that a subset of U satisfies a certain property, say π, if and only if the sum of the corresponding weights exceeds a certain threshold. This framework captures several graph classes studied in the literature, including threshold graphs [19, 39, 44], domishold graphs [2], and total domishold graphs [15, 16]. A similar approach, in which a subset of U satisfies property π if and only if the sum of the corresponding weights *equals* a certain threshold, can be used to define the classes of equistable

*A part of this work appeared as an extended abstract in [17].

graphs [45, 50] and equidominating graphs [50]. An even more general framework, encompassing also the knapsack problem, was introduced in [47]. Therein, it is only assumed that a subset of U satisfies property π if and only if the sum of the corresponding weights belongs to a set T of thresholds given by a membership oracle. If the weights are known and integer, then a dynamic programming approach can be employed to find a subset of U with the desired property of either maximum or minimum cost (according to a given cost function on the elements of the ground set) in time $\mathcal{O}(|U|M)$ and with M calls of the membership oracle, where M is a given upper bound for T. Clearly, in the special case of the unit costs and for the first threshold framework described above, a minimum-sized subset of U satisfying property π can be found by a simple greedy algorithm starting with the empty set and adding the elements in order of non-decreasing weight until the threshold is met (or exceeded).

In general, the advantages of the above framework depend both on the choice of property π and on the constraints (if any) imposed on the structure of the set of thresholds T. For example, if U is the vertex set of a graph, property π denotes the property of being an independent (stable) set in a graph, and T is restricted to be an interval unbounded from below, we obtain the class of *threshold graphs* [19], which is very well understood and admits many characterizations and linear time algorithms for recognition and several optimization problems (see, e.g., [44]). If π denotes the property of being a dominating set and T is an interval unbounded from above, we obtain the class of *domishold graphs* [2], which enjoys similar properties as the class of threshold graphs. On the other hand, if π is the property of being a *maximal* stable set and T is restricted to consist of a single number, we obtain the class of *equistable graphs* [50], for which the recognition complexity is open (see, e.g., [43]), no structural characterization is known, and several NP-hard optimization problems remain intractable [47].

Notions and results from the theory of Boolean functions [21] and hypergraphs [3] can be useful for the study of graph classes defined within the above framework. For instance, the characterization of hereditarily total domishold graphs in terms of forbidden induced subgraphs given in [16] is based on the facts that every threshold Boolean function is 2-asummable [18] and that every dually Sperner hypergraph is threshold [15].[1] Moreover, the fact that threshold Boolean functions are closed under dualization and can be recognized in polynomial time (when given by a complete DNF) [51] leads to efficient algorithms for recognizing total domishold graphs and for finding a minimum total dominating set in a given total domishold graph [15]. The relationship also goes the other way around, for instance, total domishold graphs can be used to characterize threshold hypergraphs and threshold Boolean functions [16].

1.2 Aim and motivation

The aim of this paper is to further exploit and explore this fruitful interplay between graphs, hypergraphs, and (equivalently) Boolean functions. We do this by studying the class of *connected-domishold* graphs, a new class of graphs that can be defined in the above framework, as follows: A *connected dominating set* (*CD set* for short) in a connected graph G is a set S of vertices of G that is *dominating*, that is, every vertex of G is either in S or has a neighbor in S, and *connected*, that is, the subgraph of G induced by S is connected. The ground set U is the vertex set of a connected graph $G = (V, E)$, property π is the property of being a connected dominating set in G, and T is an interval unbounded from above.

Our motivations for studying the notion of connected domination in the above threshold framework are twofold. First, connected domination is one of the most basic of the many variants of domination, with applications in modeling wireless networks, see, e.g., the books [25, 34, 35] and recent papers [1, 7, 12, 13, 26, 30, 37, 56–58, 61]. The connected dominating set problem is the problem of finding a

[1] In [15, 16], the hereditarily total domishold graphs were named hereditary total domishold graphs. We prefer to adopt the grammatically more correct term "hereditarily total domishold".

minimum connected dominating set in a given connected graph. This problem is NP-hard (and hard to approximate) for general graphs and remains intractable even under significant restrictions, for instance, for the class of split graphs. On the other hand, as outlined above, the problem is polynomially solvable in the class of connected-domishold graphs equipped with weights, as in the definition. This motivates the study of connected-domishold graphs and, in particular, identification of subclasses of connected-domishold graphs. This may lead to new classes of graphs where the connected dominating set problem (or its weighted version) is polynomially solvable.

Second, despite the large variety of graph domination concepts studied in the literature (see, e.g., [34, 35]), so far only few "threshold-like" graph classes were studied with respect to notions of domination: the classes of domishold and equidominating graphs (corresponding to the usual domination), the class of equistable graphs (corresponding to independent domination), and the class of total domishold graphs (corresponding to total domination). These graph classes differ significantly with respect to their structural and algorithmic properties. For instance, while the class of domishold graphs is a highly structured hereditary subclass of cographs, the classes of equistable and of total domishold graphs are not contained in any nontrivial hereditary class of graphs and are not understood from a structural point of view.[2] As mentioned above, the class of total domishold graphs can be used to characterize threshold hypergraphs. Hence, in a sense, the class of total domishold graphs is as rich as the class of threshold hypergraphs. These results, differences, and challenges provide ample motivation for the study of structural and algorithmic properties of connected-domishold graphs.

1.3 The definition

Since a disconnected graph G does not have any connected dominating sets, we restrict our attention to connected graphs in the following definition.

Definition 1.1. *A connected graph $G = (V, E)$ is said to be* connected-domishold *(CD for short) if there exists a pair (w, t) where $w : V \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a weight function and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a threshold such that for every subset $S \subseteq V$, $w(S) := \sum_{x \in S} w(x) \geq t$ if and only if S is a connected dominating set in G. Such a pair (w, t) will be referred to as a* connected-domishold (CD) structure *of G.*

We emphasize that the class of connected-domishold graphs is not the intersection of the classes of connected and domishold graphs. In fact, the two classes are incomparable: the 4-vertex cycle is connected and domishold [2] but not connected-domishold, see Example 1.3 below; the 4-vertex path is connected-domishold but not domishold. The hyphen in the name is present to remind the reader of this fact.

Example 1.2. *The complete graph of order n is connected-domishold. Indeed, any nonempty subset $S \subseteq V(K_n)$ is a connected dominating set of K_n, and the pair $(w, 1)$ where $w(x) = 1$ for all $x \in V(K_n)$ is a CD structure of K_n.*

Example 1.3. *The 4-cycle C_4 is not connected-domishold: Denoting its vertices by v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 in the cyclic order, we see that a subset $S \subseteq V(C_4)$ is CD if and only if it contains an edge. Therefore, if (w, t) is a CD structure of C_4, then $w(v_i) + w(v_{i+1}) \geq t$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ (indices modulo 4), which implies $w(V(C_4)) \geq 2t$. On the other hand, $w(v_1) + w(v_3) < t$ and $w(v_2) + w(v_4) < t$, implying $w(V(C_4)) < 2t$.*

1.4 Overview of results

Our results can be divided into four interconnected parts and can be summarized as follows:

[2] A class of graphs is said to be *hereditary* if it is closed under vertex deletion.

1) **Characterizations in terms of derived hypergraphs (resp., derived Boolean functions); a necessary and a sufficient condition.**

In a previous work [16, Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.5], total domishold graphs were characterized in terms of thresholdness of a derived hypergraph and a derived Boolean function. We give similar characterizations of connected-domishold graphs. The characterizations lead to a necessary and a sufficient condition for a graph to be connected-domishold, respectively, expressed in terms of properties of the derived hypergraph (equivalently: of the derived Boolean function).

2) **The case of split graphs. A characterization of threshold hypergraphs.**

While the classes of connected-domishold and total domishold graphs are in general incomparable, we show that they coincide within the class of connected split graphs. Building on this equivalence, we characterize threshold hypergraphs in terms of the connected-domishold property of a derived split graph. We also give examples of connected split graphs showing that neither of the two conditions for connected-domishold graphs mentioned above (one necessary and one sufficient) characterizes this property.

3) **The hereditary case.**

We observe that, contrary to the classes of threshold and domishold graphs, the class of connected-domishold graphs is not hereditary. This motivates the study of so-called *hereditarily connected-domishold graphs*, defined as graphs every connected induced subgraph of which is connected-domishold. As our main result, we give several characterizations of the class of hereditarily connected-domishold graphs. The characterizations in terms of forbidden induced subgraphs implies that the class of hereditarily connected-domishold graphs is a subclass of the class of chordal graphs properly containing two well known classes of chordal graphs, the class of block graphs and the class of trivially perfect graphs.

4) **Algorithmic aspects via vertex separators.**

Finally, we build on all these results together with some known results on connected dominating sets and minimal vertex separators in graphs to study some algorithmic aspects of the class of connected-domishold graphs and their hereditary variant. We identify a sufficient condition, capturing a large number of known graph classes, under which the CD property can be efficiently recognized. We also show that the same condition, when applied to classes of connected-domishold graphs, results in classes of graphs for which the minimum-weight connected dominating set problem (which is NP-hard even on split graphs) is polynomially solvable. This includes the classes of hereditarily connected-domishold graphs and F_2-free split graphs (see Fig. 1), thus leading to new polynomially solvable cases of the problem.



F_2

Figure 1: Graph F_2.

Structure of the paper. In Section 2, we state the necessary definitions and preliminary results on graphs, hypergraphs, and Boolean functions. In Section 3, we give characterizations of connected-domishold graphs in terms of thresholdness of derived hypergraphs and Boolean functions. Connected-domishold split graphs are studied in Section 4, where their relation to threshold hypergraphs is also

observed. The main result of the paper, Theorem 5.3, is stated in Section 5, where some of its consequences are also derived. Section 6 discusses the algorithmic aspects of connected-domishold graphs and Section 7 concludes with a proof of Theorem 5.3.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Graphs

All graphs in this paper will be finite, simple and undirected. The *(open) neighborhood* of a vertex v is the set of vertices in a graph G adjacent to v, denoted by $N_G(v)$ (or simply $N(v)$ if the graph is clear from the context); the *closed neighborhood* of v is denoted by $N_G[v]$ and defined as $N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$. The *degree* of a vertex v in a graph G is the cardinality of its neighborhood. The complete graph, the path and the cycle of order n are denoted by K_n, P_n and C_n, respectively. A *clique* in a graph is a subset of pairwise adjacent vertices, and an *independent* (or *stable*) set is a subset of pairwise non-adjacent vertices. A *universal vertex* in a graph G is a vertex adjacent to all other vertices. For a set S of vertices in a graph G, we denote by $G[S]$ the subgraph of G induced by S. For a set X of graphs, we say that a graph is X-free if it does not contain any induced subgraph isomorphic to a member of X.

The main notion that will provide the link between threshold Boolean functions and hypergraphs is that of separators in graphs. A *separator* in a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - S$ is not connected. A separator is *minimal* if it does not contain any other separator. For a pair of non-adjacent vertices u, v in a graph G, a u, v*-separator* is a set $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{u, v\}$ such that u and v are in different components of $G - S$. A u, v-separator is said to be *minimal* if it does not contain any other u, v-separator. Note that every minimal separator of G is a minimal u, v-separator for some non-adjacent vertex pair u, v, but not vice versa. The minimal separators are exactly the minimal u, v-separators that do not contain any other x, y-separator; for this reason they are often referred to as the *inclusion minimal separators*. The connection between the CD graphs and the derived hypergraphs and Boolean functions will be developed in Section 3 using the following characterization of CD sets due to Kanté et al. [36].

Proposition 2.1 (Kanté et al. [36])**.** *In every connected graph $G = (V, E)$ that is not complete, a subset $D \subseteq V$ is a CD set if and only if $D \cap S \neq \emptyset$ for every minimal separator S in G.*

In other words, the CD sets of a graph G are exactly the transversals of the hypergraph of the minimal separators of G (see Section 2.3 and Definition 3.2 for definitions of these notions).

A graph G is *chordal* if it does not contain any induced cycle of order at least 4, and *split* if it has a *split partition*, that is, a partition of its vertex set into a clique and an independent set. One of our proofs (the proof of Theorem 5.3) will rely on the following property of chordal graphs.

Lemma 2.2 (Kumar and Veni Madhavan [42])**.** *If S is a minimal separator of a chordal graph G, then each connected component of $G - S$ has a vertex that is adjacent to all the vertices of S.*

For graph theoretic notions not defined above, see, e.g., [60].

2.2 Boolean functions

Let n be positive integer. Given two vectors $x, y \in \{0,1\}^n$, we write $x \leq y$ if $x_i \leq y_i$ for all $i \in [n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$. A Boolean function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ is *positive* (or: *monotone*) if $f(x) \leq f(y)$ holds for every two vectors $x, y \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $x \leq y$. A *literal* of f is either a variable, x_i, or the negation of a variable, denoted by $\overline{x_i}$. An *implicant* of a Boolean function f is a conjunction C of literals such that $f(x) = 1$ for all $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ for which C takes value 1 (we also say that C *implies* f). An implicant is said to be *prime* if it is not implied by any other implicant. If f is positive, then none of the variables appearing in any of its prime implicants appears negated. Every n-variable positive

Boolean function f can be expressed with its *complete DNF (disjunctive normal form)*, defined as the disjunction of all prime implicants of f.

A positive Boolean function f is said to be *threshold* if there exist non-negative real weights $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ and a non-negative real number t such that for every $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, $f(x) = 0$ if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i \leq t$. Such a pair (w, t) is called a *separating structure* of f. Every threshold Boolean function admits an integral separating structure (see [21, Theorem 9.5]). A positive Boolean function $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is threshold if and only if its *dual function* $f^d(x) = \overline{f(\overline{x})}$ is threshold [21]; moreover, if $(w_1, \ldots, w_n, t)$ is an integral separating structure of f, then $(w_1, \ldots, w_n, \sum_{i=1}^n w_i - t - 1)$ is a separating structure of f^d.

Threshold Boolean functions have been characterized in [18] and [28], as follows. For $k \geq 2$, a positive Boolean function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ is said to be *k-summable* if, for some $r \in \{2, \ldots, k\}$, there exist r (not necessarily distinct) false points of f, say, $x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^r$, and r (not necessarily distinct) true points of f, say $y^1, y^2, \ldots, y^r$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^r x^i = \sum_{i=1}^r y^i$. (A *false point* of f is an input vector $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $f(x) = 0$; a *true point* is defined analogously.) Function f is said to be *k-asummable* if it is not k-summable, and it is *asummable* if it is k-asummable for all $k \geq 2$.

Theorem 2.3 (Chow [18], Elgot [28], see also [21, Theorem 9.14])**.** *A positive Boolean function f is threshold if and only if it is asummable.*

The problem of determining whether a positive Boolean function given by its complete DNF is threshold is solvable in polynomial time, using dualization and linear programming (see [51] and [21, Theorem 9.16]). The algorithm tests if a polynomially sized derived linear program has a feasible solution, and in case of a yes instance, the solution found yields a separating structure of the given function. Using, e.g., Karmarkar's interior point method for linear programming [38], one can assure that a rational solution is found. This results in a rational separating structure, which can be easily turned into an integral one. We summarize this result as follows.

Theorem 2.4. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm for recognizing threshold Boolean functions given by the complete DNF. In case of a yes instance, the algorithm also computes an integral separating structure of the given function.*

Remark 2.5. The existence of a "purely combinatorial" polynomial time recognition algorithm for threshold Boolean functions (that is, one not relying on solving an auxiliary linear program) is an open problem [21].

A similar approach as the one outlined above shows that every connected-domishold graph has an integral CD structure; we will often use this fact throughout the paper. For further background on Boolean functions, we refer to the comprehensive monograph [21].

2.3 Hypergraphs

A *hypergraph* is a pair $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ where V is a finite set of *vertices* and E is a set of subsets of V, called *hyperedges* [3]. When the vertex set or the hyperedge set of $\mathcal{H}$ will not be explicitly given, we will refer to them by $V(\mathcal{H})$ and $E(\mathcal{H})$, respectively. A *transversal* (or: *hitting set*) of $\mathcal{H}$ is a set $S \subseteq V$ such that $S \cap e \neq \emptyset$ for all $e \in E$. A hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ is *threshold* if there exist a weight function $w : V \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and a threshold $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all subsets $X \subseteq V$, it holds that $w(X) \leq t$ if and only if X contains no hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$ [33]. Such a pair (w, t) is said to be a *separating structure* of $\mathcal{H}$.

To every hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$, we can naturally associate a positive Boolean function $f_{\mathcal{H}} : \{0,1\}^V \to \{0,1\}$, defined by the positive DNF expression

$$f_{\mathcal{H}}(x) = \bigvee_{e \in E} \bigwedge_{u \in e} x_u$$

for all $x \in \{0,1\}^V$. Conversely, to every positive Boolean function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ given by a positive DNF $\phi = \bigvee_{j=1}^m \bigwedge_{i \in C_j} x_i$, we can associate a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(\phi) = (V, E)$ as follows: $V = [n]$ and $E = \{C_1, \ldots, C_m\}$. It follows directly from the definitions that the thresholdness of hypergraphs and of Boolean functions are related as follows.

Proposition 2.6. *A hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ is threshold if and only if the positive Boolean function $f_{\mathcal{H}}$ is threshold. A positive Boolean function given by a positive DNF $\phi = \bigvee_{j=1}^m \bigwedge_{i \in C_j} x_i$ is threshold if and only if the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(\phi)$ is threshold.*

Applying Theorem 2.3 to the language of hypergraphs gives the following characterization of threshold hypergraphs. For $k \geq 2$, a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ is said to be *k-summable* if, for some $r \in \{2, \ldots, k\}$, there exist r (not necessarily distinct) subsets $A_1, \ldots, A_r$ of V such that each A_i contains a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$, and r (not necessarily distinct) subsets $B_1, \ldots, B_r$ of V such that each B_i does not contain a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$ and such that for every vertex $v \in V$, we have:

$$|\{i : v \in A_i\}| = |\{i : v \in B_i\}|. \tag{1}$$

We say that a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ is *k-asummable* if it is not k-summable and it is *asummable* if it is k-asummable for all $k \geq 2$.

Corollary 2.7. *A hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ is threshold if and only if it is asummable.*

Recall that a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ is said to be *Sperner* (or: a *clutter*) if no hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$ contains another hyperedge, that is, if for every two distinct hyperedges e and f of $\mathcal{H}$, it holds that $\min\{|e \setminus f|, |f \setminus e|\} \geq 1$. Chiarelli and Milanič defined in [15,16] the notion of *dually Sperner hypergraphs* as the hypergraphs such that the inequality $\min\{|e \setminus f|, |f \setminus e|\} \leq 1$ holds for every pair of distinct hyperedges e and f of $\mathcal{H}$. It was proved in [15,16] that dually Sperner hypergraphs are threshold; they were applied in the characterizations of total domishold graphs and their hereditary variant. More recently, Boros et al. introduced in [9] the following restriction of dually Sperner hypergraphs.

Definition 2.8 (Boros et al. [9])**.** *A hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ is said to be* 1-Sperner *if for every two distinct hyperedges e and f of $\mathcal{H}$, it holds that* $\min\{|e \setminus f|, |f \setminus e|\} = 1$.

Note that a hypergraph is 1-Sperner if and only if it is both Sperner and dually Sperner. In particular, for Sperner hypergraphs the notions of dually Sperner and 1-Sperner hypergraphs coincide. Since a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ is threshold if and only if the Sperner hypergraph obtained from $\mathcal{H}$ by keeping only its inclusion-wise minimal hyperedges is threshold, the fact that dually Sperner hypergraphs are threshold is equivalent to the following fact, proved constructively by Boros et al. in [9] using a composition result for 1-Sperner hypergraphs developed therein.

Theorem 2.9. *Every 1-Sperner hypergraph is threshold.*

3 Connected-domishold graphs via hypergraphs and Boolean functions

In a previous work [16, Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.5], total domishold graphs were characterized in terms of thresholdness of a derived hypergraph and a derived Boolean function. In this section we give similar characterizations of connected-domishold graphs.

For completeness, we first recall some relevant definitions and a result from [16]. A *total dominating set* in a graph G is a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that every vertex of G has a neighbor in S. Note that only graphs without isolated vertices have total dominating sets. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is said to be *total domishold* (TD for short) if there exists a pair (w, t) where $w : V \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a weight function and

$t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a threshold such that for every subset $S \subseteq V$, $w(S) := \sum_{x \in S} w(x) \geq t$ if and only if S is a total dominating set in G. A pair (w, t) as above will be referred to as a *total domishold (TD) structure* of G. The *minimal neighborhood hypergraph* of a graph G is the hypergraph denoted by $MNH(G)$ and defined as follows: the vertex set of $MNH(G)$ is $V(G)$ and the hyperedge set consists precisely of the *minimal neighborhoods* in G, that is, of the inclusion-wise minimal sets in the family of neighborhoods $\{N(v) : v \in V(G)\}$.[3] Note that a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a total dominating set in G if and only if it is a transversal of $MNH(G)$.

Proposition 3.1 (Chiarelli and Milanič [16])**.** *For a graph $G = (V, E)$, the following are equivalent:*

1. *G is total domishold.*
2. *Its minimal neighborhood hypergraph $MNH(G)$ is threshold.*

The constructions of the derived hypergraph and the derived Boolean function used in our characterizations of connected-domishold graphs in terms of their thresholdness are specified by the following two definitions.

Definition 3.2. *Given a graph G, the* minimal separator hypergraph *of G is the hypergraph $MSH(G) = (V(G), \mathcal{S}(G))$, where $\mathcal{S}(G) = \{S : S \subseteq V(G)$ and S is a minimal separator in $G\}$.*

Given a finite non-empty set V, we denote by $\{0,1\}^V$ the set of all binary vectors with coordinates indexed by V. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a binary vector $x \in \{0,1\}^V$, its *support set* is the set denoted by $S(x)$ and defined by $S(x) = \{v \in V : x_v = 1\}$. In the following definition, we associate a Boolean function to a given n-vertex graph G. In order to avoid fixing a bijection between its vertex set and the set $[n]$, we will consider the corresponding Boolean function as defined on the set $\{0,1\}^V$, where $V = V(G)$. Accordingly, a separating structure of such a Boolean function can be seen as a pair (w, t) where $w : V \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for every $x \in \{0,1\}^V$, we have $f(x) = 0$ if and only if $\sum_{v \in S(x)} w(v) \leq t$.

Definition 3.3. *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, its* minimal separator function *is the positive Boolean function $f_G^{ms} : \{0,1\}^V \to \{0,1\}$ that takes value 1 precisely on vectors $x \in \{0,1\}^V$ whose support set contains some minimal separator of G.*

The announced characterizations of connected-domishold graphs in terms of their minimal separator hypergraphs and minimal separator functions are given in the following proposition. The proof is based on two ingredients: the characterization of the connected dominating sets of a given (non-complete) graph given by Proposition 2.1 and the fact that threshold Boolean functions are closed under dualization.

Proposition 3.4. *For a connected graph $G = (V, E)$, the following are equivalent:*

1. *G is connected-domishold.*
2. *Its minimal separator hypergraph $MSH(G)$ is threshold.*
3. *Its minimal separator function f_G^{ms} is threshold.*

Moreover, if G is not a complete graph, and (w, t) is an integral separating structure of f_G^{ms} or of $MSH(G)$, then $(w, w(V) - t)$ is a CD structure of G.

[3] In [16], the minimal neighborhood hypergraph of G was named *reduced neighborhood hypergraph* (of G) and denoted by $\mathcal{RN}(G)$. We changed the terminology in analogy with the term "minimal separator hypergraph", which will be introduced shortly.

Proof. We will consider two cases, depending on whether G is a complete graph or not.

Case 1: G is complete.

In this case all the three statements hold. Recall that every complete graph is CD (see Example 1.2). Since complete graphs have no minimal separators, the set of hyperedges of the minimal separator hypergraph $MSH(G)$ is empty. Hence by Corollary 2.7 the hypergraph $MSH(G)$ is threshold. The absence of (minimal) separators also implies that the minimal separator function f_G^{ms} is constantly equal to 0 and hence threshold.

Case 2: G is not complete.

First we will show the equivalence between statements 1 and 3. Since a positive Boolean function f is threshold if and only if its dual function $f^d(x) = \overline{f(\overline{x})}$ is threshold, it suffices to argue that G is connected-domishold if and only if $(f_G^{ms})^d$ is threshold.

We claim that for every $x \in \{0,1\}^V$, we have $(f_G^{ms})^d(x) = 1$ if and only if $S(x)$, the support set of x, is a connected dominating set of G. Let $x \in \{0,1\}^V$ and let S be the support set of x. By definition, $(f_G^{ms})^d(x) = 1$ if and only if $f_G^{ms}(\overline{x}) = 0$, which is the case if and only if $V \setminus S$ does not contain any minimal separator of G. This is in turn equivalent to the condition that S is a transversal of the minimal separator hypergraph of G, and, by Proposition 2.1, to the condition that S is a connected dominating set of G. Therefore, $(f_G^{ms})^d(x) = 1$ if and only if S is a connected dominating set of G, as claimed.

Now, if G is connected-domishold, then it has an integral connected-domishold structure, say (w,t), and $(w,t-1)$ is a separating structure of the dual function $(f_G^{ms})^d$, which implies that $(f_G^{ms})^d$ is threshold. Conversely, if the dual function is threshold, with an integral separating structure (w,t), then $(w,t+1)$ is a connected-domishold structure of G. This establishes the equivalence between statements 1 and 3.

Next, we show the equivalence between statements 2 and 3. Note that the complete DNF of f_G^{ms}, the minimal separator function of G, is given by the expression $\bigvee_{S \in \mathcal{S}(G)} \bigwedge_{u \in S} x_u$. It now follows directly from the definitions of threshold Boolean functions and threshold hypergraphs that function $f_G^{ms}(x)$ is threshold if and only if hypergraph $MSH(G)$–the hyperedges of which are exactly the elements of $\mathcal{S}(G)$–is threshold.

Finally, if (w,t) is an integral separating structure of f_G^{ms}, then $(w, w(V)-t-1)$ is a separating structure of $(f_G^{ms})^d$ and hence $(w, w(V)-t)$ is a connected-domishold structure of G. □

Recall that every 1-Sperner hypergraph is threshold (Theorem 2.9) and every threshold hypergraph is asummable (Corollary 2.7). Thus, in particular, every threshold hypergraph is 2-asummable. Applying these relations to the specific case of the minimal separator hypergraphs leads to the following.

Definition 3.5. *We say that a graph G is* 1-Sperner with respect to separators *if its minimal separator hypergraph $MSH(G)$ is 1-Sperner. Similarly, we say that G is* 2-asummable with respect to minimal separators *if its minimal separator hypergraph $MSH(G)$ is 2-asummable.*

Corollary 3.6. *For every connected graph G, the following holds:*

1. *If G is 1-Sperner w.r.t. separators, then G is connected-domishold.*
2. *If G is connected-domishold, then G is 2-asummable w.r.t. separators.*

We will show in Section 4.1 that neither of the two statements in Corollary 3.6 can be reversed. On the other hand, we will prove in Section 5 that all the three properties become equivalent in the hereditary setting.

4 Connected-domishold split graphs

The following examples show that for general connected graphs, the CD and TD properties are incomparable:

- The path P_6 is connected-domishold (it has a unique minimal connected dominating set, formed by the four vertices of degree two) but it is not total domishold (see, e.g., [16]).
- The graph in Fig. 2 is TD but not CD. The graph is total domishold: it has a unique minimal



Figure 2: A TD graph that is not CD.

total dominating set, namely $\{v_1, v_4, v_5, v_8\}$. On the other hand, the graph is not connected-domishold. This can be shown by observing that it is not 2-asummable w.r.t. separators and applying Corollary 3.6. To see that the minimal separator hypergraph of G is 2-summable, note that condition (1) is satisfied if we take $k = r = 2$ and $A_1 = \{v_2, v_7\}$, $A_2 = \{v_3, v_6\}$, $B_1 = \{v_2, v_3\}$, and $B_2 = \{v_6, v_7\}$.

Interestingly, we will show in Section 5 that if the CD and TD properties are required also for all induced subgraphs, then the corresponding graph classes are comparable (see Corollary 5.7). In the rest of this section, we will prove that the two properties coincide in the class of connected split graphs and examine some consequences of this result. Recall that a graph is split if and only if its vertex set has a partition into a clique and an independent set. Foldes and Hammer characterized split graphs as exactly the graphs that are $\{2K_2, C_4, C_5\}$-free [29]. In particular, this implies that a split graph can be disconnected only if it has an isolated vertex.

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a connected graph and let G' be the graph obtained from G by adding to it a universal vertex. Then, G is connected-domishold if and only if G' is connected-domishold.*

Proof. Let $V(G') = V(G) \cup \{u\}$, where u is the added vertex. Suppose that G is connected-domishold and let (w, t) be a CD structure of G. Since the set of connected dominating sets of G' consists of all connected dominating sets of G together with all subsets of $V(G')$ containing u, we can obtain a CD structure, say (w', t'), of G' by setting $w'(x) = w(x)$ for all $x \in V(G)$, $w'(u) = t$, and $t' = t$. Therefore, G' is connected-domishold.

Conversely, if (w', t') is a CD structure of G', then (w, t) where $t = t'$ and w is the restriction of w' to $V(G)$ is a CD structure of G. This is because a set $X \subseteq V(G)$ is a connected dominating set of G if and only if it is a connected dominating set of G'. Therefore, if G' is connected-domishold then so is G. □

Recall that given a connected graph G, we denote by $MSH(G)$ (resp., $MNH(G)$) its *minimal separator (resp., minimal neighborhood) hypergraph.*

Lemma 4.2. *Let G be a connected split graph without universal vertices. Then $MSH(G) = MNH(G)$.*

Proof. Fix a split partition of $V(G)$, say $V(G) = K \cup I$ where K is a clique, I is an independent set, and $K \cap I = \emptyset$. Clearly, the hypergraphs $MSH(G)$ and $MNH(G)$ have the same vertex set. To show that the hyperedge sets are also the same, we proceed in two steps.

First, we show that $E(MSH(G)) \subseteq E(MNH(G))$, that is, that every minimal separator is a minimal neighborhood. To this end, it suffices to show that every minimal separator S in G *is* a neighborhood, that is, a set of the form $S = N(v)$ for some $v \in V(G)$. This is indeed enough, because if a minimal separator S in G satisfies $S = N(v)$ for some $v \in V(G)$, but $N(v)$ properly contains some other neighborhood, say $N(u)$, then the fact that $N(u)$ is a separator in G (for instance, it is a u, v-separator) would imply that S is not a minimal separator.

Let S be a minimal separator in G. Then, S is a minimal u, v-separator for some non-adjacent vertex pair u, v; in particular, $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{u, v\}$. We claim that $N(u) \subseteq S$ or $N(v) \subseteq S$. Suppose that this is not the case. Then, there exist a neighbor of u, say u', such that $u' \notin S$, and a neighbor of v, say v', such that $v' \notin S$. Since $\{u, v, u', v'\} \subseteq V(G) \setminus S$ and u and v are in different components of $G - S$, vertices u' and v' are distinct and non-adjacent. Thus, at least one of u' and v', say u', is in I. This implies that $u \in K$ and therefore $v \in I$, which implies that $v' \in K$ and hence (u, v', v) is a u, v-path in $G - S$, a contradiction. This shows that $N(u) \subseteq S$ or $N(v) \subseteq S$, as claimed. Since each of $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ is a u, v-separator, the fact that S is a minimal u, v-separator implies that $S \in \{N(u), N(v)\}$. This completes the proof of the inclusion $E(MSH(G)) \subseteq E(MNH(G))$.

It remains to show that $E(MNH(G)) \subseteq E(MSH(G))$. Let S be a minimal neighborhood in G. Then $S = N(v)$ for some $v \in V(G)$. Since v is not universal, the set $V(G) \setminus N[v]$ is non-empty. Therefore S is a v, w-separator for any $w \in V(G) \setminus N[v]$; in particular, S is a separator in G. Suppose for a contradiction that S is not a minimal separator in G. Then S properly contains some minimal separator, say S', in G. By the first part of the proof, S' is of the form $S' = N(z)$ for some $z \in V(G)$. However, since $N(z)$ is a neighborhood properly contained in $S = N(v)$, this contradicts the fact that S is a minimal neighborhood. □

Theorem 4.3. *A connected split graph is connected-domishold if and only if it is total domishold.*

Proof. If G is complete, then G is both connected-domishold and total domishold. So we may assume that G is not complete. More generally, we show next that we may assume that G does not have any universal vertices. Suppose that G has a universal vertex, say u, and let $G' = G - u$. By [16, Proposition 3.3], G is TD if and only if G' is TD. If G' is not connected, then $\{u\}$ is the only minimal connected dominating set of G and hence G is connected-domishold in this case. Furthermore, G is also total domishold: since G' is a disconnected $2K_2$-free graph, G' has an isolated vertex. Therefore, by [16], G' is TD, and hence so is G. If G' is connected, then by Lemma 4.1, G is CD if and only if G' is CD. Therefore, the problem of verifying whether the CD and the TD properties are equivalent for G reduces to the same problem for G'. An iterative application of the above argument eventually reduces the graph to either a graph where both properties hold or to a connected graph without universal vertices.

Now, let G be a connected split graph without universal vertices. By Proposition 3.4, G is connected-domishold if and only if its minimal separator hypergraph $MSH(G)$ is threshold. By Proposition 3.1, G is total domishold if and only if its minimal neighborhood hypergraph $MNH(G)$ is threshold. Therefore, to prove the theorem it suffices to show that $MSH(G) = MNH(G)$. But this was established in Lemma 4.2. □

Theorem 4.3 implies another relation between connected-domishold (split) graphs and threshold hypergraphs, one that in a sense reverses the one stated in Proposition 3.4. Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$, the *split-incidence graph* of $\mathcal{H}$ (see, e.g., [36]) is the split graph G such that $V(G) = V \cup E$, V is a clique, E is an independent set, and $v \in V$ is adjacent to $e \in E$ if and only if $v \in e$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ be a hypergraph with $\emptyset \notin E$. Then $\mathcal{H}$ is threshold if and only if its split-incidence graph is connected-domishold.*

Proof. Since $\emptyset \notin E$, the split-incidence graph of $\mathcal{H}$ is connected. It was shown in [16] that a hypergraph is threshold if and only if its split-incidence graph is total domishold. The statement of the theorem now follows from Theorem 4.3. □

It might be worth pointing out that in view of Remark 2.5 and Theorem 4.4, it is an open problem of whether there is a "purely combinatorial" polynomial time algorithm for recognizing connected-domishold split graphs. (Further issues regarding the recognition problem of CD graphs are discussed in Section 6.1.)

4.1 Examples related to Corollary 3.6

We now show that neither of the two statements in Corollary 3.6 can be reversed. First we exhibit an infinite family of CD split graphs that are not 1-Sperner w.r.t. separators.

Example 4.5. *Let $n \geq 4$ and let $G = K_n^*$ be the graph obtained from the complete graph K_n by gluing a triangle on every edge. Formally, $V(G) = \{u_1, \ldots, u_n\} \cup \{v_{ij} : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$ and $E(G) = \{u_i u_j : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \cup \{u_i v_{jk} \mid 1 \leq j < k \leq n \text{ and } i \in \{j, k\}\}$. The graph G is a CD graph: setting*

$$w(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in \{u_1, \ldots, u_n\}; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and $t = n - 1$ results in a CD structure of G. On the other hand, G is not 1-Sperner w.r.t. separators. Since every pair of the form $\{u_i, u_j\}$ with $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ is a minimal separator of G, the minimal separator hypergraph contains $\{u_1, u_2\}$ and $\{u_3, u_4\}$ as hyperedges and is therefore not 1-Sperner.

Next, we show that there exists a split graph that is 2-asummable w.r.t. separators but is not CD. As observed already in [16], the fact that not every 2-asummable positive Boolean function is threshold can be used to construct split graphs G such that $MNH(G)$ is 2-asummable and G is not total domishold. Using the result of Theorem 4.3 and its proof, this implies the existence of split graphs G that are 2-asummable w.r.t. separators but not CD. For the sake of self-containment, we describe an example of such a construction in some detail.

Example 4.6. *Based on an example due to Gabelman [31], Crama and Hammer proposed in the proof of [21, Theorem 9.15] and example of a 9-variable 2-asummable positive Boolean function f that is not threshold. From this function we can derive a split graph $G = (V, E)$ on 71 vertices, as follows. Let $V = K \cup I$ where $K = \{v_1, \ldots, v_9\}$ is a clique and $I = V(G) - K$ is an independent set. To define the edges between K and I, we first associate a non-negative integer weight to each vertex, as follows: $w(v_1) = 14$, $w(v_2) = 18$, $w(v_3) = 24$, $w(v_4) = 26$, $w(v_5) = 27$, $w(v_6) = 30$, $w(v_7) = 31$, $w(v_8) = 36$, $w(v_9) = 37$, and $w(v) = 0$ for all $v \in I$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of all subsets S of K such that $w(S) \geq 82$ and let $S_1 = \{v_1, v_6, v_9\}$, $S_2 = \{v_2, v_5, v_8\}$, and $S_3 = \{v_3, v_4, v_7\}$. (Note that $w(S_i) = 81$ for all $i \in [3]$.) Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the hypergraph with vertex set K and hyperedge set given by the inclusion-wise minimal sets in $\mathcal{S} \cup \{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$. It can be verified that $\mathcal{H}$ has precisely 62 hyperedges (including S_1, S_2, and S_3).[4] The edges of G between vertices of I and K are defined so that set of the neighborhoods of the 62 vertices of I is exactly the set of hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$.*

To show that G is not CD, it suffices, by Proposition 3.4, to show that the minimal separator hypergraph is not threshold. In the proof of Theorem 9.15 in [21] it is shown that the function f is not threshold, by showing that f is 3-summable. This corresponds to the fact that the hypergraph of minimal separators of G is 3-summable, as can be observed by noticing that condition (1) is satisfied for $k = r = 3$ and for the sets $A_i = S_i$ for all $i \in [3]$ and $B_1 = \{v_1, v_7, v_8\}$, $B_2 = \{v_2, v_4, v_9\}$, and $B_3 = \{v_3, v_5, v_6\}$. On the other hand, the fact that f is 2-asummable implies that G is 2-asummable w.r.t. separators.

[4] The following is the list of sets (omitting commas and brackets) of indices of the elements of the 62 inclusion-wise minimal hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$: 169, 179, 189, 258, 259, 268, 269, 278, 279, 289, 347, 348, 349, 357, 358, 359, 367, 368, 369, 378, 379, 389, 456, 457, 458, 459, 467, 468, 469, 478, 479, 489, 567, 568, 569, 578, 579, 589, 678, 679, 689, 789, 1234, 1235, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1239, 1245, 1246, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1256, 1257, 1267, 1345, 1346, 1356, 2345, 2346, 2356.

5 The hereditary case

In this section we state the main result of this paper, Theorem 5.3, which gives several characterizations of graphs all connected induced subgraphs of which are CD, and derive some of its consequences. We start with an example showing that, contrary to the classes of threshold and domishold graphs, the class of connected-domishold graphs is not hereditary. We assume notation from Example 1.3.

Example 5.1. *The graph G obtained from C_4 by adding to it a new vertex, say v_5, and making it adjacent exactly to one vertex of the C_4, say to v_4, is CD: the (inclusion-wise) minimal CD sets of G are $\{v_1, v_4\}$ and $\{v_3, v_4\}$, hence a CD structure of G is given by $w(v_2) = w(v_5) = 0$, $w(v_1) = w(v_3) = 1$, $w(v_4) = 2$, and $t = 3$.*

This motivates the following definition:

Definition 5.2. *A graph G is said to be* hereditarily connected-domishold *(*hereditarily CD *for short) if every connected induced subgraph of G is connected-domishold.*

In general, for a property Π of connected graphs, a graph is said to be *hereditarily* Π if every connected induced subgraph of it satisfies Π. Characterizations of classes of hereditarily Π graphs where Π denotes the property that the graph has a connected dominating set inducing a graph with a certain property Π' were given, for various choices of property Π', by Michalak in [46]. In [53], Pržulj et al. gave characterizations of hereditarily Π graphs where Π denotes the property that the graph has a dominating pair of vertices (that is, a pair of vertices such that every path between them is dominating). The class of hereditarily connected-domishold graphs corresponds to the case when Π is the property of being connected-domishold. Moreover, we will say that a graph G is *hereditarily* 1*-Sperner with respect to separators* if every connected induced subgraph of G is 1-Sperner w.r.t. separators. The property of G being *hereditarily* 2*-asummable with respect to separators* is defined analogously.

Theorem 5.3. *For every graph G, the following are equivalent:*

1. *G is hereditarily CD.*
2. *G is hereditarily 2-asummable w.r.t. separators.*
3. *G is hereditarily 1-Sperner w.r.t. separators.*
4. *G is an $\{F_1, F_2, H_1, H_2, \ldots\}$-free chordal graph, where the graphs F_1, F_2, and a general member of the family $\{H_i\}$ are depicted in Fig. 3.*



Figure 3: Graphs F_1, F_2, and H_i.

Theorem 5.3 will be proved in Section 7. In the rest of this section, we examine some of the consequences of the forbidden induced subgraph characterization of hereditarily CD graphs given by Theorem 5.3. The *diamond* and the *kite* (also known as the *co-fork* or the *co-chair*) are the graphs depicted in Fig. 4.

The equivalence between items 1 and 4 in Theorem 5.3 implies that the class of hereditarily CD graphs is a proper generalization of the class of kite-free chordal graphs.



Figure 4: The diamond and the kite.

Corollary 5.4. *Every kite-free chordal graph is hereditarily CD.*

Corollary 5.4 further implies that the class of hereditarily CD graphs generalizes two well known classes of chordal graphs, the class of block graphs and the class of trivially perfect graphs. A graph is said to be a *block graph* if every block (maximal connected subgraph without cut vertices) of it is complete. The block graphs are well known to coincide with the diamond-free chordal graphs. A graph G is said to be *trivially perfect* [32] if for every induced subgraph H of G, it holds $\alpha(H) = |\mathcal{C}(H)|$, where $\alpha(H)$ denotes the *independence number* of H (that is, the maximum size of an independent set in H), and $\mathcal{C}(H)$ denotes the set of all maximal cliques of H. Trivially perfect graphs coincide with the so-called *quasi-threshold graphs* [62], and are exactly the $\{P_4, C_4\}$-free graphs [32].

Corollary 5.5. *Every block graph is hereditarily CD. Every trivially perfect graph is hereditarily CD.*

Another class of graphs contained in the class of hereditarily CD graphs is the class of graphs defined similarly as the hereditarily CD graphs but with respect to total dominating sets. These so-called *hereditarily total domishold graphs* (abbreviated *hereditarily TD graphs*) were studied in [16], where characterizations analogous to those given by Theorem 5.3 were obtained, including the following characterization in terms of forbidden induced subgraphs.

Theorem 5.6. *For every graph G, the following are equivalent:*

1. *G is hereditarily total domishold.*
2. *No induced subgraph of G is isomorphic to a graph in Fig. 5.*



Figure 5: The set of forbidden induced subgraphs for the class of hereditarily total domishold graphs.

Theorems 5.3 and 5.6 imply the following.

Corollary 5.7. *Every hereditarily TD graph is hereditarily CD.*

Proof. It suffices to verify that each of the forbidden induced subgraphs for the class of hereditarily connected-domishold graphs contains one of the graphs from Fig. 5 as induced subgraph. A cycle C_k with $k \geq 4$ contains (or is equal to) one of C_4, C_5, C_6, P_6. The graphs F_1 and F_2 are contained in both sets of forbidden induced subgraphs. Finally, each graph of the form H_i where $i \geq 1$ contains $2K_3$ as induced subgraph. □

Since a graph is split if and only if it is $\{2K_2, C_4, C_5\}$-free and each of the forbidden induced subgraphs for the class of hereditarily total domishold graphs other than F_2 contains either $2K_2$, C_4, or C_5 as induced subgraph, Corollary 5.7 implies the following.

Corollary 5.8. *Every F_2-free split graph is hereditarily CD.*

Fig. 6 shows a Hasse diagram depicting the inclusion relations among the class of hereditarily connected-domishold graphs and several well studied graph classes. All definitions of graph classes depicted in Fig. 6 and the relations between them can be found in [22], with the exception of the hereditarily CD and hereditarily TD graphs. The fact that every co-domishold graph is hereditarily TD and that every hereditarily TD graph is $(1, 2)$-polar chordal was proved in [16]. The remaining inclusion and non-inclusion relations can be easily verified using the forbidden induced subgraph characterizations of the depicted graph classes [11, 22, 33].



Figure 6: A Hasse diagram depicting the inclusion relations within several families of perfect graphs, focused around the class of hereditarily connected-domishold graphs.

6 Algorithmic aspects via vertex separators

In this section, we discuss some algorithmic issues related to connected-domishold graphs and their hereditary counterpart.

6.1 The recognition problems

We start with the computational complexity aspects of the problems of recognizing whether a given graph is CD, resp. hereditarily CD. For general graphs, the computational complexity of recognizing connected-domishold graphs is not known. We now show that the hypergraph approach outlined in Section 3 leads to a sufficient condition for the problem to be polynomially solvable in a large number of graph classes. The condition is expressed using the notion of minimal vertex separators. Recall that a *separator* in a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - S$ is not connected and that a separator is *minimal* if it does not contain any other separator. Recall also that a u, v-*separator* (for a pair of non-adjacent vertices u, v) is a set $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{u, v\}$ such that u and v are in different components of $G-S$ and that a u, v-separator is *minimal* if it does not contain any other u, v-separator. A *minimal vertex separator* in G is a minimal u, v-separator for some non-adjacent vertex pair u, v.[5]

A sufficient condition for the polynomial time solvability of the recognition problem for CD graphs in a class of graphs $\mathcal{G}$ is that there exists a polynomial poly such that every connected graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ has at most poly($|V(G)|$) minimal vertex separators. This is the case for chordal graphs, which have at most $|V(G)|$ minimal vertex separators [55], as well as for many other classes of graphs, including permutation graphs, circle graphs, circular-arc graphs, chordal bipartite graphs, trapezoid graphs, cocomparability graphs of bounded dimension, distance-hereditary graphs, and weakly chordal graphs (see, e.g., [10, 40, 48]). For a polynomial poly, let $\mathcal{G}_{\text{poly}}$ be the class of graphs with at most poly($|V(G)|$) minimal vertex separators. Since every minimal separator is a minimal vertex separator, every connected graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{poly}}$ has at most poly($|V(G)|$) minimal separators.

It is known that the set of all minimal vertex separators of a given connected n-vertex graph can be enumerated in output-polynomial time. More precisely, Berry et al. [4] have developed an algorithm solving this problem in time $\mathcal{O}(n^3|\Sigma|)$ where Σ is the set of all minimal vertex separators of G, improving on earlier (independently achieved) running times of $\mathcal{O}(n^5|\Sigma|)$ due to Shen and Liang [59] and Kloks and Kratsch [41]. Based on these results, we derive the following.

Theorem 6.1. *For any polynomial* poly*, there is a polynomial time algorithm to determine whether a given connected graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{poly}}$ is connected-domishold. In case of a yes instance, the algorithm also computes an integral CD structure of G.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E) \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{poly}}$ be a connected graph that is the input to the algorithm.

The algorithm proceeds as follows. If G is complete, then G is connected-domishold and an integral CD structure of G is returned, say (w, t) with $w(x) = 1$ for all $x \in V(G)$ and $t = 1$. Assume now that G is not complete. First, using the algorithm of Berry et al. [4], we compute in time $\mathcal{O}(|V(G)|^3\text{poly}(|V(G)|))$ the set Σ of all minimal vertex separators of G. Next, the minimal separator hypergraph, $MSH(G)$, is computed by comparing each pair of sets in Σ and discarding the non-minimal ones. Since $MSH(G)$ is Sperner, there is a bijective correspondence between the hyperedges of $MSH(G)$ and the prime implicants of the minimal separator function f_G^{ms}; this yields the complete DNF of f_G^{ms}. Finally, we run the algorithm given by Theorem 2.4 on the complete DNF of f_G^{ms}. If f_G^{ms} is not threshold, then we conclude that G is not connected-domishold. Otherwise, the algorithm returned an integral separating structure, say (w, t), of f_G^{ms}. In this case we return $(w, w(V) - t)$ as a CD structure of G.

It is clear that the algorithm runs in polynomial time. Its correctness follows from Proposition 3.4. □

[5] Minimal vertex separators are sometimes referred to as *minimal separators*. According to the definition of a minimal separator adopted in this paper, every minimal separator of G is a minimal vertex separator, but not vice versa.

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ be the largest hereditary graph class such that a connected graph $G \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is connected-domishold if and only if it is total domishold. By Theorem 4.3, class $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is a generalization of the class of split graphs. Since there is a polynomial time algorithm for recognizing total domishold graphs [15, 16], there is a polynomial time algorithm to determine whether a given connected graph $G \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is connected-domishold. This motivates the following question (which we leave open):

Question. *What is the largest hereditary graph class $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ such that a connected graph $G \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is connected-domishold if and only if it is total domishold?*

A polynomial time recognition algorithm for the class of hereditarily CD graphs can be derived from the characterization of hereditarily CD graphs in terms of forbidden induced subgraphs given by Theorem 5.3.

Proposition 6.2. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm to determine whether a given graph G is hereditarily CD. In the case of a yes instance, an integral CD structure of G can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof. One can verify in linear time that G is chordal [33] and verifying that G is also $\{F_1, F_2, H_1, H_2\}$-free can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(|V(G)|^8)$. Therefore, we only have to show that we can check in polynomial time that G does not contain an induced subgraph of the form H_i for each $i > 2$. Observe that for all $i > 2$ the graph H_i contains an induced subgraph isomorphic to $2D$, the union of two diamonds (see Fig. 3 and Fig. 4). In $\mathcal{O}(|V(G)^8|)$ time, we can enumerate all induced subgraphs F of G isomorphic to $2D$. For each such subgraph F we have to verify whether it can be extended to an induced subgraph of the form H_i, for some $i > 2$. We do this as follows. Let D_1 and D_2 be the connected components (diamonds) of F. Furthermore, let u_1, u_2 be the two vertices of degree 2 in D_1 and similarly let v_1, v_2 be the two vertices of degree 2 in D_2. Now we can verify that F is not contained in any induced subgraph of G isomorphic to H_i (for some $i > 2$) by checking for each pair u_i, v_j, with $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, that u_i and v_j belong to different components of $G - (N_{G-u_i}[V(D_1) \setminus \{u_i\}] \cup N_{G-v_j}[V(D_2) \setminus \{v_j\}])$. This can be done in polynomial time and consequently the recognition of hereditarily CD graphs is a polynomially solvable problem.

The second part of the theorem follows from Theorem 6.1, since every hereditarily CD graph is chordal and chordal graphs are a subclass of $\mathcal{G}_p$ for the polynomial $p(n) = n$ [55]. □

It might seem conceivable that a similar approach as the one used in Theorem 6.1 could be used to develop an efficient algorithm for recognizing connected-domishold graphs in classes of graphs with only polynomially many minimal connected dominating sets. However, it is not known whether there exists an output-polynomial time algorithm for the problem of enumerating minimal connected dominating sets. In fact, as shown by Kanté et al. [36], even when restricted to split graphs, this problem is equivalent to the well-known Trans-Enum problem in hypergraphs, the problem of enumerating the inclusion-minimal transversals of a given hypergraph. The Trans-Enum problem has been intensively studied but it is still open whether there exists an output-polynomial time algorithm for the problem (see, e.g., the survey [27]).

6.2 The minimum-weight connected dominating set problem

The Minimum-Weight Connected Dominating Set (MWCDS) problem takes as input a connected graph G together with a cost function $c : V(G) \to \mathbb{R}^+$, and the task is to compute a connected dominating set of minimum total cost, where the cost of a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is defined, as usual, as $c(S) = \sum_{v \in S} c(v)$. This NP-hard problem [35] has been studied extensively due to its many applications in networking (see, e.g., [7, 25, 61]). The problem is not only NP-hard but also hard to approximate, even for split graphs. This can be seen as follows: Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ be a Sperner hypergraph with $E \notin \{\{\emptyset\}, \{V\}\}$ and let G be its split-incidence graph. Then G is a connected split graph

without universal vertices, hence $MSH(G) = MNH(G)$ by Lemma 4.2. It can be seen that the hyperedge set of $MNH(G)$ is exactly E, and therefore Proposition 2.1 implies that the problem of finding a minimum connected dominating set in G is equivalent to the HITTING SET problem in hypergraphs, the problem of finding a minimum transversal of a given hypergraph. This latter problem is known to be equivalent to the well-known SET COVER problem and hence inapproximable to within a factor of $(1-\epsilon)\log|V|$, unless $\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{NP}$ [23]. It follows that the MWCDS problem is hard to approximate to within a factor of $(1-\epsilon)\log|V(G)|$, even in the class of split graphs.

This computational intractability of the MWCDS problem motivates the question of identifying restrictions on the input instances under which the problem can be solved efficiently. In this section, we show that the MWCDS problem is polynomially solvable in the class of hereditarily CD graphs, and consequently in the class of F_2-free split graphs. This is done by further exploiting the connections with vertex separators and Boolean functions.

First, we recall the following known results about: (i) the relation between the numbers of prime implicants of a threshold Boolean function and its dual, and (ii) the complexity of dualizing threshold Boolean functions. These results were proved in the more general context of regular Boolean functions (as well as for other generalizations, see, e.g., [8]).

Theorem 6.3. *Let f be an n-variable threshold Boolean function having exactly p prime implicants. Then:*

1. *(Bertolazzi and Sassano [6], Crama [20], see also [21, Theorem 8.29]) The dual function f^d has at most q prime implicants, where q is the total number of variables in the complete DNF of f.*
2. *(Crama and Hammer [21, Theorem 8.28] and Peled and Simeone [52]) There is an algorithm running in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2p)$ that, given the complete DNF of f, computes the complete DNF of the dual function f^d.*

We remark that the algorithm by Crama and Hammer [21] is already presented as having time complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^2p)$, while the one by Peled and Simeone [52] is claimed to run in time $\mathcal{O}(np)$. However, since f^d can have $\mathcal{O}(np)$ prime implicants, the total size of the output is of the order $\mathcal{O}(n^2p)$. The time complexity $\mathcal{O}(np)$ of the algorithm by Peled and Simeone relies on the assumption that the algorithm outputs the prime implicants of the dual function one by one, each time overwriting the previous prime implicant (with a constant number of operations per implicant on average).

The above relation between the numbers of prime implicants of a threshold Boolean function and its dual implies that classes of connected-domishold graphs with only polynomially many minimal separators are exactly the same as the classes of connected-domishold graphs with only polynomially many minimal connected dominating sets. More precisely:

Lemma 6.4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an n-vertex connected-domishold graph that is not complete. Let ν_c (resp. ν_s) denote the number of minimal connected dominating sets (resp. of minimal separators) of G. Then $\nu_s \leq (n-2)\nu_c$ and $\nu_c \leq (n-2)\nu_s$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, the minimal separator function f_G^{ms} is threshold. Function f_G^{ms} is an n-variable function with exactly ν_s prime implicants in its complete DNF. Recall from the proof of Proposition 3.4 that the dual function $(f_G^{ms})^d$ takes value 1 precisely on the vectors $x \in \{0,1\}^V$ whose support is a connected dominating set of G. Therefore, the prime implicants of $(f_G^{ms})^d$ are in bijective correspondence with the minimal connected dominating sets of G and the number of prime implicants of $(f_G^{ms})^d$ is exactly ν_c. Since every minimal separator of G has at most $n-2$ vertices, Theorem 6.3 implies that $\nu_c \leq (n-2)\nu_s$, as claimed.

Conversely, since $f_G^{ms} = ((f_G^{ms})^d)^d$, the inequality $\nu_s \leq (n-2)\nu_c$ can be proved by a similar approach, provided we show that every minimal connected dominating set of G has at most $n-2$ vertices. But this is true since if D is a connected dominating set of G with at least $n-1$ vertices,

with $V(G) \setminus \{u\} \subseteq D$ for some $u \in V(G)$, then a smaller connected dominating set D' of G could be obtained by fixing an arbitrary spanning tree T of $G[D]$ and deleting from D an arbitrary leaf v of T such that $N_G(u) \neq \{v\}$. (Note that since G is connected but not complete, it has at least three vertices, hence T has at least two leaves.) This completes the proof. □

We now have everything ready to derive the main result of this section. Recall that for a polynomial poly, we denote by $\mathcal{G}_{\text{poly}}$ the class of graphs with at most poly($|V(G)|$) minimal vertex separators.

Theorem 6.5. *For any nonzero polynomial* poly*, the set of minimal connected dominating sets of an n-vertex connected-domishold graph from $\mathcal{G}_{\text{poly}}$ has size at most $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \text{poly}(n))$ and can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \text{poly}(n) \cdot (n^2 + \text{poly}(n)))$. In particular, the MWCDS problem is solvable in polynomial time in the class of connected-domishold graphs from $\mathcal{G}_{\text{poly}}$.*

Proof. Let poly and G be as in the statement of the theorem and let $\mathcal{C}(G)$ be the set of minimal connected dominating sets of G. If G is complete, then $\mathcal{C}(G) = \{\{v\} : v \in V(G)\}$ and thus $|\mathcal{C}(G)| = n = \mathcal{O}(n\text{poly}(n))$ (since the polynomial is nonzero). Otherwise, we can apply Lemma 6.4 to derive $|\mathcal{C}(G)| \leq (n-2) \cdot \text{poly}(n)$.

A polynomial time algorithm to solve the MWCDS problem for a given connected-domishold graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{poly}}$ with respect to a cost function $c : V(G) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ can be obtained as follows. First, we may assume that G is not complete, since otherwise we can return a set $\{v\}$ where v is a vertex minimizing $c(v)$. We use a similar approach as in the proof of Theorem 6.1. Using the algorithm of Berry et al. [4], we compute in time $\mathcal{O}(n^3\text{poly}(n))$ the set Σ of all minimal vertex separators of G. We can assume that each minimal vertex separator has its elements listed according to some fixed order of $V(G)$ (otherwise, we can sort them in time $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \text{poly}(n))$ using, e.g., bucket sort). The minimal separator hypergraph, $MSH(G)$, is then computed by comparing each pair of sets in Σ and discarding the non-minimal ones; this can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(n(\text{poly}(n))^2)$. The minimal separator hypergraph directly corresponds to the complete DNF of the minimal separator function f_G^{ms}.

The next step is to compute the complete DNF of the dual function $(f_G^{ms})^d$. By Theorem 6.3, this can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2\text{poly}(n))$. Since each term of the DNF is a prime implicant of $(f_G^{ms})^d$ and the prime implicants of $(f_G^{ms})^d$ are in bijective correspondence with the minimal connected dominating sets of G, we can read off from the DNF all the minimal connected dominating sets of G. The claimed time complexity follows.

Once the list of all minimal connected dominating sets is available, a polynomial time algorithm for the MWCDS problem on (G, c) follows immediately. □

In the case of chordal graphs, we can improve the running time by using one of the known linear-time algorithms for listing the minimal vertex separators of a given chordal graph due to Kumar and Veni Madhavan [42], Chandran and Grandoni [14], and Berry and Pogorelcnik [5].

Theorem 6.6. *Every n-vertex connected-domishold chordal graph has at most $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ minimal connected dominating sets, which can be enumerated in time $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. In particular, the MWCDS problem is solvable in time $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ in the class of connected-domishold chordal graphs.*

Proof. Let G be an n-vertex connected-domishold chordal graph. The theorem clearly holds for complete graphs, so we may assume that G is not complete. Since G is chordal, it has at most n minimal vertex separators [55]; consequently, G has at most n minimal separators. Since G is connected-domishold, it has at most $n(n-2)$ minimal connected dominating sets, by Lemma 6.4.

The minimal connected dominating sets of G can be enumerated as follows. First, we compute all the $\mathcal{O}(n)$ minimal vertex separators of G in time $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ (where $m = |E(G)|$) using one of the known algorithms for this problem on chordal graphs [5, 14, 42]. Assuming again that each minimal vertex separator has its elements listed according to some fixed order of $V(G)$, we then eliminate those that are not also minimal separators in time $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$, by directly comparing each of the $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ pairs for inclusion.

The list of $\mathcal{O}(n)$ minimal separators of G yields its minimal separator function, f_G^{ms}. The list of minimal connected dominating sets of G can be obtained in time $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ by dualizing f_G^{ms} using one of the algorithms given by Theorem 6.3. The MWCDS problem can now be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ by evaluating the cost of each of the $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ minimal connected dominating sets and outputting one of minimum cost. □

Corollary 6.7. *The MWCDS problem is solvable in time $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ in the class of hereditarily CD graphs and in particular in the class of F_2-free split graphs.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.3, every hereditarily CD graph is chordal so Theorem 6.6 applies. The statement for F_2-free split graphs follows from Corollary 5.8. □

We conclude this section with two remarks, one related to Theorem 6.6 and one related to Theorems 6.1 and 6.5.

Remark 6.8. The bound $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ given by Theorem 6.6 on the number of minimal connected dominating sets in an n-vertex connected-domishold chordal graph is sharp. There exist n-vertex connected-domishold chordal graphs with $\Theta(n^2)$ minimal connected dominating sets. For instance, let S_n be the split graph with $V(S_n) = K \cup I$ where $K = \{u_1, \ldots, u_n\}$ is a clique, $I = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ is an independent set, $K \cap I = \emptyset$, and for each $i \in [n]$, vertex u_i is adjacent to all vertices of I except v_i. Since every vertex in I has a unique non-neighbor in K, we infer that S_n is F_2-free. Therefore, by Corollary 5.8 S_n is a (hereditarily) connected-domishold graph. Note that every set of the form $\{u_i, u_j\}$ where $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ is a minimal connected dominating set of S_n. It follows that S_n has at least $\binom{n}{2} = \Theta(|V(S_n)|^2)$ minimal connected dominating sets.

Remark 6.9. Theorems 6.1 and 6.5 motivate the question of whether there is a polynomial poly such that every connected CD graph G has at most poly($|V(G)|$) minimal vertex separators. As shown by the following family of graphs, this is not the case. For $n \geq 2$, let G_n be the graph obtained from the disjoint union of n copies of the P_4, say (x_i, a_i, b_i, y_i) for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, by identifying all vertices x_i into a single vertex x, all vertices y_i into a single vertex y, and for each vertex z other than x or y, adding a new vertex z' and making it adjacent only to z. It is not difficult to see that G_n has exactly two minimal CD sets, namely $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \cup \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\} \cup \{v\}$ for $v \in \{x, y\}$. A CD structure of G_n is given by (w, t) where $t = 4n + 1$, $w(x) = w(y) = 1$, $w(a_i) = w(b_i) = 2$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $w(z) = 0$ for all other vertices z. Therefore, G_n is CD. However, G_n has $4n + 2$ vertices and 2^n minimal x, y-separators, namely all sets of the form $\{c_1, \ldots, c_n\}$ where $c_i \in \{a_i, b_i\}$ for all i.

7 Proof of Theorem 5.3

Theorem 5.3 (restated)**.** *For every graph G, the following are equivalent:*

1. *G is hereditarily CD.*
2. *G is hereditarily 2-asummable w.r.t. separators.*
3. *G is hereditarily 1-Sperner w.r.t. separators.*
4. *G is an $\{F_1, F_2, H_1, H_2, \ldots\}$-free chordal graph, where the graphs F_1, F_2, and a general member of the family $\{H_i\}$ are depicted in Fig. 3.*

Proof. The implications $3 \Rightarrow 1 \Rightarrow 2$ follow from Corollary 3.6.

For the implication $2 \Rightarrow 4$, we only need to verify that none of the graphs in the set $\mathcal{F} := \{C_k : k \geq 4\} \cup \{F_1, F_2\} \cup \{H_i : i \geq 1\}$ is 2-asummable w.r.t. separators. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Suppose first that F is a cycle C_k for some $k \geq 4$, let u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 be four consecutive vertices on the cycle. Let

$A_1 = \{u_1, u_3\}$, $A_2 = \{u_2, u_4\}$, $B_1 = \{u_1, u_2\}$ and $B_2 = \{u_3, u_4\}$. Then, A_1 and A_2 are minimal separators of F and thus hyperedges of the hypergraph $MSH(F)$, while B_1 and B_2 do not contain any minimal separator of F and are consequently independent sets in the hypergraph $MSH(F)$. Since the sets A_1, A_2, B_1 and B_2 satisfy condition (1), this implies that the hypergraph $MSH(F)$ is 2-summable. If $F \in \{F_1, F_2\} \cup \{H_i : i \geq 1\}$, then let a and b be the two vertices of degree 2 in F, let $N(a) = \{a_1, a_2\}$, $N(b) = \{b_1, b_2\}$, let $A_1 = N(a)$, $A_2 = N(b)$, $B_1 = \{a_1, b_1\}$ and $B_2 = \{a_2, b_2\}$. The rest of the proof is the same as above.

It remains to show the implication $4 \Rightarrow 3$. Since the class of $\{F_1, F_2, H_1, H_2, \ldots\}$-free chordal graphs is hereditary, it is enough to show that every $\{F_1, F_2, H_1, H_2, \ldots\}$-free chordal graph is 1-Sperner w.r.t. separators.

Take a connected $\{F_1, F_2, H_1, H_2, \ldots\}$-free chordal graph $G = (V, E)$ and suppose for a contradiction that $MSH(G)$ is not 1-Sperner w.r.t. separators. Then, there exist two minimal separators in G, say S and S', such that $\min\{|S|, |S'|\} \geq 2$. Let $C = \{a, b\}$ for some $a, b \in S \setminus S'$ with $a \neq b$ and let $C' = \{a', b'\}$ for some $a', b' \in S' \setminus S$ with $a' \neq b'$. Further, let X, Y be two components of $G - S$ and X', Y' two components of $G - S'$. By Lemma 2.2, there exist vertices $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ such that each of x and y dominates S and $x' \in X'$ and $y' \in Y'$ such that each of x' and y' dominates S'. Define $Z = \{x, y\}$ and $Z' = \{x', y'\}$.

Claim 1. *Either $N(x) \cap \{a', b'\} = \emptyset$ or $N(y) \cap \{a', b'\} = \emptyset$. Similarly, either $N(x') \cap \{a, b\} = \emptyset$ or $N(y') \cap \{a, b\} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. If $N(x) \cap \{a', b'\} \neq \emptyset$ and $N(y) \cap \{a', b'\} \neq \emptyset$, then there exists an (x, y)-path in $G - S$, contrary to the fact that S is an (x, y)-separator. The other statement follows similarly. □

Notice that $C \cap C' = C \cap Z = C' \cap Z' = \emptyset$ and so $|C \cup C'| = |C \cup Z| = |C' \cup Z'| = 4$. Further, since every minimal separator in a chordal graph is a clique [24], C and C' are cliques. On the other hand, Z and Z' are independent sets, therefore $|C \cap Z'| \leq 1$ and $|C' \cap Z| \leq 1$.

Claim 2. *$|N(C') \cap Z| \leq 1$ and $|N(C) \cap Z'| \leq 1$.*

Proof. If $|N(C') \cap Z| > 1$ then $Z \subseteq N(C')$. Since $C' \cap S = \emptyset$, this implies that x and y are in the same connected component of $G - S$, a contradiction. The other statement follows by symmetry. □

Claim 2 implies that $Z \neq Z'$. Up to symmetry, it remains to analyze five cases, depending whether the sets C, C', Z, Z' have vertices in common (where possible) or not. In what follows we use the notation $u \sim v$ (resp. $u \nsim v$) to denote the fact that two vertices u and v are adjacent (resp. non-adjacent).

Case 3: $|C \cap Z'| = |Z \cap Z'| = 1$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a = x'$. Since $C \cap Z = \emptyset$ and $a = x'$ it follows that $x' \notin Z$, implying $Z \cap Z' = \{y'\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $y' = y$. But the fact that $y \sim a$ implies $y' \sim x'$, leading to a contradiction.

The case $|C' \cap Z| = |Z \cap Z'| = 1$ is symmetric to Case 3.

Case 4: $|Z \cap Z'| = 1$ and $C \cap Z' = C' \cap Z = \emptyset$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x = x'$. Since $a, b \notin S'$ and S' separates x' and y', we conclude that $N(y') \cap \{a, b\} = \emptyset$. By symmetry, $N(y) \cap \{a', b'\} = \emptyset$, and consequently, $y' \notin S$ and $y \notin S'$. Since S separates x and y and $\{a', b', y'\} \cap S = \emptyset$, we have $N(y) \cap \{a', b', y'\} = \emptyset$, and, similarly, $N(y') \cap \{a, b, y\} = \emptyset$.

We must have $y \nsim y'$ since otherwise G contains either an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{y, a, a', y'\}$ (if $a \sim a'$) or an induced C_5 on the vertex set $\{y, a, x = x', a', y'\}$ (otherwise).

To avoid an induced copy of H_1 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, x = x', a', b', y'\}$, we may assume, without loss of generality, that $a \sim a'$.

Suppose first that $b \sim b'$. Then also $a \sim b'$ or $a' \sim b$, since otherwise $\{a, a', b', b\}$ would induce a copy of C_4. But now (depending if we have one edge or both) the vertex set $\{y, a, b, a', b', y'\}$ induces a copy of either F_1 or of F_2. Therefore, $b \nsim b'$.

Suppose that $a' \sim b$. But now, either the vertex set $\{y, a, b, x = x', a', b'\}$ induces a copy of F_2 (if $a \nsim b'$), or the vertex set $\{y, a, b, a', b', y'\}$ induces a copy of F_1 (if $a \sim b'$). Therefore, $a' \nsim b$, and by symmetry, $a \nsim b'$. But now, the vertex set $\{y, a, b, x = x', a', b'\}$ induces a copy of F_1, a contradiction.

Case 5: $|C \cap Z'| = |C' \cap Z| = 1$ and $Z \cap Z' = \emptyset$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a = x'$ and $a' = x$. By Claim 1 it follows that $b \nsim y'$. The fact that $y \nsim x = a'$ implies $y \notin S'$ (since S' is a clique) and consequently also $y \nsim y'$ (otherwise $x' = a$ and y' would be in the same component of $G - S'$). To avoid an (x, y)-path in $G - S$, we conclude that $y \nsim b'$. Now, the vertices $\{a = x', a' = x, b, b', y, y'\}$ induce either a copy of F_1 (if $b \nsim b'$) or of F_2 (otherwise). In either case, we reach a contradiction.

Case 6: $|C \cap Z'| = 1$ and $C' \cap Z = Z \cap Z' = \emptyset$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a = x'$. By Claim 2, we have $|N(C') \cap Z| \leq 1$. Thus, we may assume that $x \notin N(C')$. Consequently, $N(x) \cap \{a', b'\} = \emptyset$ and therefore also $x \nsim y'$, for otherwise we would have a C_4 induced by $\{a, a', y', x\}$. To avoid an (x', y')-path in $G - S'$, we conclude that $b \nsim y'$. Moreover, we also have $N(b) \cap \{a', b'\} = \emptyset$, since otherwise the vertex set $\{x, a = x', a', b, b', y'\}$ induces either a copy of F_1 (if $|N(b) \cap \{a', b'\}| = 1$) or of F_2 (otherwise). If $y \sim y'$, then, to avoid an induced C_4 on $\{y, a = x', a', y'\}$, we conclude that $y \sim a'$. But now we have a copy of F_1 induced by $\{x, b, a = x', a', y, y'\}$, a contradiction. Thus, $y \nsim y'$, implying also $N(y) \cap \{a', b'\} = \emptyset$, since otherwise the vertex set $\{b, a = x', y, a', b', y'\}$ induces either a copy of F_1 (if $|N(y) \cap \{a', b'\}| = 1$) or of F_2 (otherwise).

Since neither of the vertices a', b' and y' is adjacent to b and S is a clique containing b, we conclude that $\{a', b', y'\} \cap S = \emptyset$. In particular, if K denotes the component of $G - S$ containing a', this implies $b', y' \in V(K)$. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a vertex $w \in V(K)$ that dominates S. Since S separates x from y, we have $\{x, y\} \nsubseteq K$; without loss of generality, we may assume that $y \notin V(K)$. Let $P = (w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k)$ be a shortest $\{a', b', y'\}$–w path in K where $w_1 \in \{a', b', y'\}$ and $w_k = w$. Since w_1 is not adjacent to b but w_k is, we have $k > 1$.

Suppose that $k = 2$. If $w \nsim y'$, then the vertex set $\{b, a = x', w, a', b', y'\}$ induces either a copy of F_1 (if $|N(w) \cap \{a', b'\}| = 1$) or of F_2 (otherwise), a contradiction. Hence $w \sim y'$. To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertices $\{w, a = x', a', y'\}$, we conclude that $w \sim a'$. But now, the vertex set $\{y, a = x', b, w, a', y'\}$ induces a copy of F_1, a contradiction. Therefore, $k \geq 3$.

To avoid an induced copy of a cycle of order at least 4, we conclude that vertex $a = x'$ dominates P. If $y' \sim w_2$ then also $a' \sim w_2$ and $b' \sim w_2$ (or otherwise we would have an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{a = x', w_2, b', y'\}$ or $\{a = x', w_2, a', y'\}$) but that gives us an induced F_1 on the vertex set $\{y', a', a = x', w_2, w_3, w_4\}$ (where $w_4 = b$ if $k = 3$). Therefore, $y' \nsim w_2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $w_1 = a'$. But now, the vertex set $\{y', a' = w_1, b', a = x', w_2, w_3\}$ induces a copy of either F_1 (if $b' \nsim w_2$) or of F_2 (otherwise), a contradiction.

The case $|C' \cap Z| = 1$ and $C \cap Z' = Z \cap Z' = \emptyset$ is symmetric to Case 6.

Case 7: $C' \cap Z = C \cap Z' = Z \cap Z' = \emptyset$.

We will analyze this case depending on the number of edges between $\{x, y\}$ and $\{x', y'\}$. Let $k := |\{xx', xy', yx', yy'\} \cap E(G)|$. Clearly $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, since $k = 4$ would imply an induced C_4 $\{x, y, x', y'\}$.

Case 7.1: $k = 3$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{xx', xy', yx', yy'\} \cap E(G) = \{xx', yx', yy'\}$. To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{a, x, x', y\}$, we have $x' \sim a$ and, for a similar reason, $y \sim a'$.

To avoid an (x, y)-path in $G - S$, we have $x \nsim a'$, and, similarly, $y' \nsim a$. But now, the vertex set $\{x, a, x', y, a', y'\}$ induces either a copy of F_1 (if $a \nsim a'$) or of F_2 (otherwise), a contradiction.

Case 7.2: $k = 2$.

Up to symmetry, we have two subcases:

Case 7.2.1: $\{xx', xy', yx', yy'\} \cap E(G) = \{xx', yy'\}$.

By Claim 1 vertices x', y' cannot be both adjacent to a. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x' \nsim a$.

Suppose that $a \nsim a'$. If $y \sim a'$ then $x \nsim a'$ and $\{y, a, x, x', a'\}$ induces a C_5, a contradiction. Therefore $y \nsim a'$. If $y' \sim a$ then the subgraph of G induced by $\{a, x, x', a', y'\}$ contains an induced C_4 or C_5 (depending on whether $x \sim a'$ or not), a contradiction. Therefore $y' \nsim a$. But now, the graph $G[\{a, x, x', a', y', y\}]$ contains an induced C_5 or C_6 (depending on whether $x \sim a'$ or not). This shows that $a \sim a'$.

To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{x, x', a', a\}$, we infer that $x \sim a'$; consequently, by Claim 1 $a' \nsim y$. To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{a, a', y', y\}$, we further infer that $a \sim y'$; but now, the vertex set $\{x', x, a', a, y', y\}$ induces a copy of F_1, a contradiction.

Case 7.2.2: $\{xx', xy', yx', yy'\} \cap E(G) = \{xx', yx'\}$.

First observe that in this case $x' \in S$, since otherwise S would not separate x from y. In particular, since S is a clique, this implies $a \sim x'$ and $b \sim x'$. Furthermore, this implies that $N(y') \cap \{a, b\} = \emptyset$, for otherwise S' would not separate x' and y'. Replacing $C = \{a, b\}$ with $\tilde{C} = \{x', b\}$, we can now use the same arguments as in Case 6 to obtain a contradiction.

Case 7.3: $k = 1$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{xx', xy', yx', yy'\} \cap E(G) = \{xx'\}$.

We will analyze this case depending on the number ℓ of edges between C and C'. Formally, let $\ell := |\{aa', ab', ba', bb'\} \cap E(G)|$.

Case 7.3.1: $\ell = 0$.

First observe that $y \nsim a'$, since otherwise $x \nsim a'$ and the subgraph $G[\{y, a, x, x', a'\}]$ would either contain an induced C_4 (if $b \sim x'$) or would be isomorphic to C_5 (otherwise). Similar arguments imply that $y \nsim b'$, $y' \nsim a$, and $y' \nsim b$. Furthermore, in order to avoid an induced H_1 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, x, a', b', y'\}$, vertex x can not be adjacent to both a' and b'. By symmetry, x' can not be adjacent to both a and b. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x' \nsim b$ and $x \nsim b'$. If $x \sim a'$, then also $x' \sim a$, since otherwise we would have an induced H_1 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, x, x', a', b'\}$, but now we have an induced F_1 on the vertex set $\{a, b, x, x', b', a'\}$. Therefore $x \nsim a'$, and by symmetry $x' \nsim a$. But now, G contains an induced copy of H_2 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, x, x', a', b', y'\}$, a contradiction.

Case 7.3.2: $\ell = 1$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{aa', ab', ba', bb'\} \cap E(G) = \{ba'\}$.

To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{x, x', a', b\}$, we may assume without loss of generality that $x \sim a'$. By Claim 1, this implies that $y \nsim a'$ and $y \nsim b'$. To avoid an induced F_1 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, x, a', x'\}$, we infer that $N(x') \cap \{a, b\} \neq \emptyset$. Claim 1 implies that $y' \nsim a$ and $y' \nsim b$. If $x' \nsim b$, then $x' \sim a$, but now an induced C_4 arises on the vertex set $\{x', a, b, a'\}$. Therefore, $x' \sim b$.

Furthermore, to avoid an induced F_2 on the vertex set $\{a, x, b, x', a', b'\}$, we infer that $\{ax', b'x\} \cap E(G) \neq \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $ax' \in E(G)$. But now, we get an induced F_1 on the vertex set $\{a, b, x', a', b', y'\}$, a contradiction.

Case 7.3.3: $\ell = 2$.

To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{a, b, a', b'\}$, we infer that the two edges in $\{aa', ab', ba', bb'\} \cap E(G)$ must share an endpoint. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{aa', ab', ba', bb'\} \cap E(G) = \{ba', bb'\}$.

Suppose first that $x' \sim b$. Then $y' \nsim a$ and $y' \nsim b$. To avoid an induced F_2 on the vertex set $\{x, x', b, a', b', y\}$, we infer that $N(x) \cap \{a', b'\} \neq \emptyset$ and consequently $y \nsim a'$ and $y \nsim b'$. If $x \sim b'$, then the vertex set $\{a, b, x, a', b', y'\}$ induces a copy of either F_1 (if $x \nsim a'$) or of F_2 (otherwise), a contradiction. Therefore, $x \nsim b'$, and a similar argument shows that also $x \nsim a'$. But now G contains an induced F_2 on the vertex set $\{x, b, x', a', b', y'\}$, a contradiction.

Suppose now that $x' \nsim b$ and notice that this implies $x' \nsim a$, or otherwise we would have an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{b, a', x', b'\}$. To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{x, x', a', b\}$, we infer that $x \sim a'$. This implies that $y \nsim a'$ and $y \nsim b'$. But now we have an induced F_1 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, x, a', x'\}$, a contradiction.

Case 7.3.4: $\ell = 3$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{aa', ab', ba', bb'\} \cap E(G) = \{aa', ba', bb'\}$.

To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{x, x', a', b\}$, we may assume without loss of generality that $x \sim a'$ and consequently (by Claim 1) $y \nsim a'$ and $y \nsim b'$. To avoid an induced F_1 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, a', b', y'\}$, we infer that $N(y') \cap \{a, b\} \neq \emptyset$, implying $x' \nsim a$ and $x' \nsim b$. But now we have an induced F_1 on the vertex set $\{a, b, b', y, a', x'\}$, a contradiction.

Case 7.3.5: $\ell = 4$.

To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{a, x, x', a'\}$, we may assume without loss of generality that $x \sim a'$ and by Claim 1 this implies $N(y) \cap \{a', b'\} = \emptyset$.

If $y' \nsim a$ and $y' \nsim b$, then the vertex set $\{y, a, b, a', b', y'\}$ induces a copy of F_2, a contradiction. We may assume without loss of generality that $y' \sim b$ and by Claim 1 $x' \nsim a$ and $x' \nsim b$. But now we have an induced F_2 the vertex set $\{a, b, b', y, a', x'\}$, a contradiction.

Case 7.4: $k = 0$.

Similarly as in Case 3, we will analyze several subcases depending on the number ℓ of edges between C and C'.

Case 7.4.1: $\ell = 1$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{aa', ab', ba', bb'\} \cap E(G) = \{ba'\}$.

Notice that y can not be adjacent to both a' and b', since otherwise $x \nsim a'$ and $x \nsim b'$ (by Claim 1), and consequently an induced copy of F_1 arises on the vertex set $\{x, a, b, y, a', b'\}$. By a symmetric argument, we infer that y can not be adjacent to both a and b. Similar arguments applied to x and x' imply that $\{x, y\} \cap S' = \emptyset$ and $\{x', y'\} \cap S = \emptyset$. Let K be the component of $G - S'$ such that $b \in V(K)$. Then $\{a, b, y\} \subseteq V(K)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $y' \notin V(K)$. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a vertex $w' \in V(K)$ that dominates S'. Clearly, $w' \notin \{a, b, y, a', b'\}$. Moreover, since $y' \notin V(K)$, we have $w' \neq y'$ and $w' \nsim y'$. Let K' be the component of $G - S$ such that $a' \in V(K')$. Then $\{a', b', y'\} \subseteq V(K')$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $y \notin V(K')$. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a vertex $w \in V(K')$ that dominates S. Clearly, $w \notin \{a, b, a', b', y'\}$. Moreover, since $y \notin V(K')$, we have $w \neq y$ and $w \nsim y$.

Notice that $w \neq w'$, since otherwise the vertex set $\{y, a, b, w = w', a', b'\}$ would induce a copy of F_1. Moreover, we have $w \nsim w'$, $w \nsim y'$, and $y \nsim w'$, since otherwise we could use the same arguments as in Cases 1, 2, or 3, with $Z = \{x, y\}$ and $Z' = \{x', y'\}$ replaced with $\tilde{Z} = \{w, y\}$ and $\tilde{Z}' = \{w', y'\}$, respectively, to derive a contradiction.

Since $y \notin V(K')$, we infer that $y \nsim a'$ and $y \nsim b'$. Similarly, since $y' \notin V(K)$, we have $y' \nsim a$ and $y' \nsim b$. If $w' \sim a$, then also $w' \sim b$, since otherwise the vertex set $\{w', a, b, a'\}$ would induce a C_4. But now we have an induced F_1 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, w', a', b'\}$. Therefore, $w' \nsim a$, and by a

symmetric argument also $w \nsim b'$. Further notice that if $b \sim w'$ and $a' \sim w$, then we have an induced F_1 on the vertex set $\{a, b, w, w', a', b'\}$. Hence, we may assume without loss of generality that $b \nsim w'$.

Let $P' = (w'_1 = w', w'_2, \ldots, w'_p)$ be a shortest w'–$\{a, b, y\}$ path in K, and similarly, let $P = (w_1 = w, w_2, \ldots, w_q)$ be a shortest w–$\{a', b', w', y'\}$ path in K'. Since $w' \notin \{a, b, y\}$ and $w \notin \{a', b', y'\}$, we have $p \geq 2$ and $q \geq 2$.

Suppose first that $p = 2$. Since $w'_1 = w' \nsim a$ and $w' \nsim b$, we must have $w'_2 = y$. But now, the vertex set $\{w', y, b, a'\}$ induces a C_4, a contradiction. Therefore, $p \geq 3$.

Since $w' \nsim b$, we infer that vertex a' dominates P' since otherwise G would contain an induced copy of C_j for some $j \geq 4$.

Suppose that $w'_{p-1} \sim a$. To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{a', w'_{p-1}, a, b\}$, we infer that $w'_{p-1} \sim b$. We must have $p = 3$ since if $p \geq 4$, then the vertex set $\{a, b, w'_{p-1}, a', w'_{p-2}, w'_{p-3}\}$ induces a copy of F_1. But now, an induced copy of F_1 arises either on the vertex set $\{a, b, w'_2, a', w', b'\}$ (if $b' \nsim w'_2$), or the vertex set $\{a, b, w'_2, a', b', y'\}$ (otherwise), a contradiction. Therefore, $w'_{p-1} \nsim a$.

Suppose that $w'_{p-1} \sim y$. In this case, the vertex set $\{a, b, y, w'_{p-1}, a', w'_{p-2}\}$ induces a copy of either F_1 (if $w'_{p-1} \nsim b$) or of F_2 (otherwise), a contradiction. Therefore, $w'_{p-1} \nsim y$. Consequently, $w'_p = b$.

Suppose that $w \sim a'$. If in addition $w \nsim w'_{p-1}$, then also $w \nsim w'_{p-2}$ (since otherwise the vertex set $\{w'_{p-2}, w'_{p-1}, w'_p = b, w\}$ would induce a C_4), but now, the vertex set $\{w'_{p-2}, w'_{p-1}, a', w'_p = b, w, a\}$ induces a copy of F_1, a contradiction. Therefore, $w \sim w'_{p-1}$. Let w'_i be the neighbor of w on P' minimizing i. Since $w'_1 = w' \nsim w$, we have $i > 2$. Moreover, since $w \sim w'_{p-1}$, we have $i < p$. But now, the vertex set $\{w'_{i-1}, a', w'_i, w, w'_p = b, a\}$ induces either a copy of F_1 (if $w_i \nsim b$) or of F_2 (otherwise), a contradiction. Therefore, $w \nsim a'$.

Since $w \nsim a'$, we can now apply symmetric arguments as for P' to deduce that $w_q = a'$ and that b dominates P.

Suppose first that $V(P) \cap V(P') = \emptyset$. To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{w'_{p-2}, a' = w_q, b = w'_p, w'_{q-2}\}$, we infer that $w'_{p-2} \nsim w_{q-2}$. Suppose that $w'_{p-1} \nsim w_{q-1}$. Then also $w'_{p-1} \nsim w_{q-2}$ (since otherwise we would have an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{w'_{p-1}, w_{q-2}, w_{q-1}, w_q = a'\}$) and by a symmetric argument also $w'_{p-2} \nsim w_{q-1}$. But now, we have an induced F_1 on the vertex set $\{w'_{p-2}, w_q = a', w'_{p-1}, w'_p = b, w_{q-1}, w_{q-2}\}$. Thus, $w'_{p-1} \sim w_{q-1}$. Moreover, we have either $w'_{p-2} \sim w_{q-1}$ or $w_{q-2} \sim w'_{p-1}$, since otherwise an induced F_2 arises on the vertex set $\{w_q, w_{q-1}, w_{q-2}, w'_p, w'_{p-1}, w'_{p-2}\}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $w'_{p-2} \sim w_{q-1}$. However, an induced copy of F_1 arises on vertex set $\{w'_{p-2}, a' = w_q, w_{q-1}, w_{q-2}, b = w'_p, w_{q-3}\}$ (where if $q = 2$ we define $w_{-1} = a$). This contradiction shows that $V(P) \cap V(P') \neq \emptyset$.

Since $w_q = a'$ and due to the minimality of P, we have $N(a') \cap V(P) = \{w_{q-1}\}$. On the other hand, since a' dominates P', we have $N(a') \cap V(P') = V(P')$. Therefore

$\emptyset \neq V(P) \cap V(P') = V(P) \cap \big(N(a') \cap V(P')\big) = \big(N(a') \cap V(P)\big) \cap V(P') = \{w_{q-1}\} \cap V(P') \subseteq \{w_{q-1}\}$, which yields $V(P) \cap V(P') = \{w_{q-1}\}$. A symmetric argument implies that $V(P) \cap V(P') = \{w'_{p-1}\}$; in particular, $w_{q-1} = w'_{p-1}$. To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{w'_{p-2}, a' = w_q, b = w'_p, w'_{q-2}\}$, we infer that $w'_{p-2} \nsim w_{q-2}$. But now, an induced copy of F_1 arises on vertex set $\{w'_{p-3}, w'_{p-2}, a' = w_q, w'_{p-1} = w_{q-1}, b = w'_p, w_{q-2}\}$ (where if $p = 2$ we define $w'_{-1} = b'$). This contradiction completes the proof of Case 1.

Case 7.4.2: $\ell = 2$.

To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{a, b, a', b'\}$, we infer that the two edges in $\{aa', ab', ba', bb'\} \cap E(G)$ must share an endpoint. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{aa', ab', ba', bb'\} \cap E(G) = \{ba', bb'\}$. Let K be the component of $G - S'$ such that $b \in V(K)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $y' \notin V(K)$.

If b dominates S', then replacing $Z' = \{x', y'\}$ with $\tilde{Z}' = \{b, y'\}$, we can use the same arguments as in Case 6 to obtain a contradiction. Therefore, b does not dominate S', and there exists a vertex $c' \in S'$ non-adjacent to b. In particular, $c' \notin \{x, y\}$. Since S' is a clique, we have $a' \sim c'$ and $b' \sim c'$. To avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{c', a', b, a\}$, we infer that $c' \nsim a$.

By Lemma 2.2, there exists a vertex $w \in V(K)$ such that w dominates S'. By the above, $w \neq b$; also, since $a \nsim a'$, we have $w \neq a$. Thus $w \notin C$. If $w = x$, then G contains an induced copy of F_2 on the vertex set $\{a, b, x, a', b', y'\}$, a contradiction. Therefore, $w \neq x$, and with a similar argument we obtain $w \neq y$; thus $w \notin Z$. But now we get a contradiction using the same arguments as in Case 1, replacing $C' = \{a', b'\}$ with $\tilde{C}' = \{c', b'\}$ and $Z' = \{x', y'\}$ with $\tilde{Z}' = \{w, y'\}$. (Indeed, all the assumptions of that case are fulfilled: vertices w and y' are in different connected components of $G - S'$ and each of w, y' dominates S'; the above arguments imply that $\tilde{C}' \cap Z = C \cap \tilde{Z}' = Z \cap \tilde{Z}' = \emptyset$; there exists exactly one edge between C and $\tilde{C}'$.)

Case 7.4.3: $\ell \in \{3, 4\}$.

By Claim 1, no generality is lost in assuming that $N(x) \cap \{a', b'\} = \emptyset$ and $N(x') \cap \{a, b\} = \emptyset$. But now, the vertex set $\{x, a, b, a', b', x'\}$ induces either a copy of F_1 (if $\ell = 3$) or a copy of F_2 (if $\ell = 4$), a contradiction.

Case 7.4.4: $\ell = 0$.

First, observe that $\{a', b'\} \not\subseteq N(x)$. Indeed, if $\{a', b'\} \subseteq N(x)$, then Claim 1 implies that $y \nsim a'$ and $y \nsim b'$. Also, to avoid an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{x, a', y', a\}$, we infer that $y' \nsim a$, and, by symmetry, that $y' \nsim b$. But now, an induced H_1 arises on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, x, a', b', y'\}$, a contradiction. By symmetry, we also have $\{a', b'\} \not\subseteq N(y)$, $\{a, b\} \not\subseteq N(x')$, and $\{a, b\} \not\subseteq N(y')$. In particular, this implies that $\{x, y\} \cap S' = \emptyset$, and $\{x', y'\} \cap S = \emptyset$.

Let K be the component of $G - S'$ such that $S \setminus S' \subseteq V(K)$. Since x' and y' are in different connected components of $G - S'$, we may assume without loss of generality that $y' \notin V(K)$. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a vertex $w' \in V(K)$ that dominates S'. Since neither of a, b, x, y dominates S', we have $w' \notin \{a, b, x, y\}$. We may assume that $w' \notin S$ since otherwise we could use the same arguments as in Case 6 with $C = \{a, b\}$ and $Z' = \{x', y'\}$ replaced with $\tilde{C} = \{a, w'\}$ and $\tilde{Z}' = \{w', y'\}$, respectively, to derive a contradiction. Let K' be the component of $G - S$ such that $S' \setminus S \subseteq V(K')$. Since x and y are in different connected components of $G - S$, we may assume without loss of generality that $y \notin V(K')$. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a vertex $w \in V(K')$ that dominates S. Similarly as above, we infer that $w \notin \{a', b', x', y'\}$, and we may assume that $w \notin S'$.

Notice that $w \neq w'$ since otherwise G would contain an induced H_1 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, w = w', a', b', y'\}$. Furthermore, we may assume that $\{yw', ww', wy'\} \cap E(G) = \emptyset$ since otherwise we could use the same arguments as in Cases 1, 2 or 3, with $Z = \{x, y\}$ and $Z' = \{x', y'\}$ replaced with $\tilde{Z} = \{w, y\}$ and $\tilde{Z}' = \{w', y'\}$, respectively. Moreover, similar arguments as above for x and x' imply that $\{a', b'\} \not\subseteq N(w)$ and $\{a, b\} \not\subseteq N(w')$.

Let $P = (w_1 = w', w_2, \ldots, w_p)$ be a shortest w'–$(S \setminus S')$ path in K, and let $P' = (w'_1 = w, w'_2, \ldots, w'_q)$ be a shortest w–$(S' \setminus S)$ path in K'. We may assume that $w_p = b$ and $w'_q = a'$. Since $w' \notin S$, we have $p \geq 2$; similarly, $q \geq 2$. Moreover, if $p = q = 2$ then $w' \sim b$ and $w \sim a'$, which implies an induced C_4 on the vertex set $\{w, a', w', b\}$. Hence, from now on we assume that $p \geq 3$.

Suppose that $q = 2$. Then, $w \sim a'$, and hence $w \nsim b'$. Notice that we may assume that $w_{p-1} \neq w$ since otherwise a' would have to be adjacent to all w_j for $j \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$ (to avoid an induced C_j with $j \geq 4$), but then we would have an induced H_1 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, w = w_{p-1}, w_{p-2}, w_{p-3}, a'\}$ (notice that since $w_1 = w' \nsim w = w_{p-1}$, we must have $p > 3$, hence w_{p-3} is well defined). To avoid a long induced cycle, we infer that $w_{p-1} \neq y$, and also that $w_{p-1} \sim w$ and $w_{p-1} \sim a'$. Moreover, $w_{p-1} \sim y$ since otherwise the vertex set $\{y, a, b, w, w_{p-1}, a'\}$ induces a copy of either F_1 (if $a \nsim w_{p-1}$) or of F_2 (otherwise). Notice that $w_{p-1} \notin S$ since otherwise it would be contained in $S \setminus S'$, contrary to the minimality of P. Therefore, (y, w_{p-1}, a') is a y–a' path avoiding S, contrary to the fact that y and a' are in different connected components of $G - S$. This contradiction implies that $q \geq 3$.

Suppose that $w_{p-1} = w$. By the minimality of P, we have $a \nsim w_j$ and $b \nsim w_j$ for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$. Also, since $w_1 = w' \nsim w = w_{p-1}$, we have $p \geq 4$. If $a' \sim w_3$, then we obtain an induced copy of H_i for some $i \geq 1$ on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, w = w_{p-1}, w_{p-2}, \ldots, w_j, w_{j-1}, w_{j-2}, a'\}$, where

$j \in \{3, \ldots, p\}$ is the maximum index such that $a' \sim w_j$. Therefore, $a' \nsim w_3$, and to avoid a long induced cycle, also $a' \nsim w_j$ for $j > 4$. A similar argument shows that $b' \nsim w_j$ for $j \geq 3$. If $a' \nsim w_2$ and $b' \nsim w_2$, then we obtain an induced copy of some H_i on the vertex set $V(P) \cup \{a, b, y, a', b', y'\}$. If $a' \sim w_2$ and $b' \nsim w_2$ (or vice-versa), then an induced copy of some H_i arises on the vertex set $V(P) \cup \{a, b, y, a', b'\}$, and if $a' \sim w_2$ and $b' \sim w_2$, then an induced copy of some H_i arises $(V(P) \cup \{a, b, y, a', b', y'\}) \setminus \{w'\}$. This contradiction shows that we may assume that $w_{p-1} \neq w$.

By similar arguments as above, we may assume that $w'_{q-1} \neq w'$.

Suppose first that $V(P) \cap V(P') = \emptyset$. Let $r \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$ be the maximum index such that $a' \sim w_r$. Similarly, let $s \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\}$ be the maximum index such that $b \sim w'_s$. To avoid an induced cycle C_j for some $j \geq 4$, we infer that $a' \sim w_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ and $b \sim w'_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$.

Suppose that $r = p - 1$. We consider several cases according to the value of s.

- Suppose that $s = q - 1$. Then $w_{p-1} \sim w'_{q-1}$ (otherwise the vertex set $\{b, w'_{q-1}, w'_q, w_{p-1}\}$ would induce an C_4). If $p \geq 4$, an induced F_1 arises on the vertex set $\{b, w'_{q-1}, a', w_{p-1}, w_{p-2}, w_{p-3}\}$. Hence, $p = 3$. If $q \geq 4$, then the vertex set $\{w'_{q-3}, w'_{q-2}, w'_{q-1}, w'_q = a', w_2, b = w_3\}$ induces either a copy of F_1 (if $w_2 \sim w'_{q-2}$) or F_2 (otherwise). Hence, $q = 3$. Notice that, since y and P' must be in different components of $G - S$, and $w_2 \notin S$ by minimality of P, we have $y \nsim w_2$ and by a symmetric argument also $y' \nsim w'_2$. To avoid an induced F_1 or F_2 on the vertex set $\{a, b = w_3, w = w'_1, w_2, w'_2, w'_3 = a'\}$, we have $a \sim w_2$. But now we have an induced H_1 on the vertex set $\{y, a, b, w_2, w' = w_1, a', b'\}$ (if $w_2 \nsim b'$) or $\{y, a, b, w_2, a', b', y'\}$ (otherwise).

- Suppose now that $s = q - 2$. Then, $w_{p-1} \sim w'_{q-2}$ and $w_{p-1} \sim w'_{q-1}$ (otherwise the vertex set $\{b, w'_{q-2}, w'_{q-1}, w'_q, w_{p-1}\}$ would contain an induced C_4 or C_5). If $q > 3$, then an induced F_1 arises on the vertex set $\{w'_{q-3}, w'_{q-2}, w'_{q-1}, b, w_{p-1}, a'\}$. Therefore, $q = 3$, but now the vertex set $\{y, a, b, w = w'_1, w'_2, w_{p-1}\}$ induces a copy of either F_1 (if $a \nsim w_{p-1}$) or of F_2 (otherwise).

- Suppose that $s < q - 2$. To avoid an induced cycle C_j for some $j \geq 4$, we infer that $w_{p-1} \sim w'_i$ for all $i \in \{s, s+1, \ldots, q\}$. But now, the path $\tilde{P} = (w = w'_1, \ldots, w'_s, w_{p-1}, a')$ is a w–$(S' \setminus S)$ path in K' shorter than P', a contradiction.

Suppose that $r < p - 1$ and $s < q - 1$. To avoid an induced cycle C_j for some $j \geq 4$, we infer that $w'_s \sim w_{p-1}$ and $w_r \sim w'_{q-1}$. The minimality of P implies that $w'_s \nsim w_j$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, p-3\}$. Notice that $a \nsim w_{p-1}$ since otherwise we can find an induced member of H_i on the vertex set F where

$$F = \begin{cases} \{y, a, b, w_{p-1}, \ldots, w_r, w_{r-1}, w_{r-2}, a'\}, & \text{if } r \geq 3; \\ \{y, a, b, w_{p-1}, \ldots, w_2, w_1 = w', b', a'\}, & \text{if } r = 2 \text{ and } w_2 \nsim b'; \\ \{y, a, b, w_{p-1}, \ldots, w_2, y', b', a'\}, & \text{if } r = 2 \text{ and } w_2 \sim b'; \\ \{y, a, b, w_{p-1}, \ldots, w_1 = w', y', b', a'\}, & \text{if } r = 1. \end{cases}$$

The above case analysis will be referred to as *building an H_i from D*, where D is the vertex set $\{y, a, b, w_{p-1}\}$ inducing a diamond common to all four cases.

Moreover, $w = w'_1 \nsim w_{p-1}$ since otherwise we can build an H_i either from $\{w = w'_1, a, b = w_p, w_{p-1}\}$ (if $w \nsim w_{p-2}$), or from $\{w = w'_1, b = w_p, w_{p-1}, w_{p-2}\}$ (otherwise). Since $w'_s \sim w_{p-1}$ and $w = w'_1 \nsim w_{p-1}$, we have $s \geq 2$. But now, we can build an H_i either from $\{w'_{s-1}, w'_s, b = w_p, w_{p-1}\}$ (if $w'_s \nsim w_{p-2}$), or from $\{w'_s, b = w_p, w_{p-1}, w_{p-2}\}$ (otherwise).

Suppose now that $V(P) \cap V(P') \neq \emptyset$. Let $i \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$ be the maximum index such that $w'_i \in V(P)$. Let $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ be the index such that $w'_i = w_j$. Notice that $i \geq 2$ and $j \geq 2$. Consider the path $Q = (w = w'_1, \ldots, w'_i = w_j, w_{j-1}, \ldots, w_1 = w')$. Let $D = \{y, a, b, w = w'_1\}$, and $D' = \{y', a', b', w' = w_1\}$. Vertices w and w' will be referred to as the *roots* of D and D', while vertices y and y' will be referred to as the *tips* of D and D'. Notice that each of D and D' induces a diamond, and Q is a path connecting the two roots. Moreover, we now show that the tips of D and D' do not have any neighbors on Q. By symmetry, it is enough to argue for the tip of D, that is, for y.

Since S separates y from $S' \setminus S$, vertex y has no neighbors on P'; in particular, it has no neighbors in the set $\{w'_1, \ldots, w'_i\}$. Moreover, if y has a neighbor in the set $\{w_{j-1}, \ldots, w_1\}$, say $y \sim w_r$ for some $r \in \{2, \ldots, j-1\}$, then the fact that G is chordal and $w_p = b \sim y$ implies that y is adjacent to w_s for all $s \in \{r+1, \ldots, p\}$. However, this would imply that $y \sim w_j = w'_i$, a contradiction.

We may also assume that Q is an induced path; otherwise, we replace Q with a shortest y-y' path in $G[V(Q)]$. The above considerations show that the subgraph of G induced by $D \cup D' \cup V(Q)$ contains a subgraph (not necessarily induced) isomorphic to a member of H_i (consisting thus of two diamonds and a path connecting them via their roots) with the following properties:

(i) each of the two diamonds is induced,

(ii) there are no edges connecting a vertex from one diamond with a vertex with another diamond, except perhaps edges incident with their roots (if the two roots coincide) or the unique edge on the path connecting the two roots (if the path connecting the two diamonds is of length 1),

(iii) the path connecting the two diamonds is induced, and

(iv) the tips of the diamonds do not have any neighbors on the path.

Let us call a subgraph satisfying the properties (i)–(iv) a *weakly induced* H_i. Among all subgraphs of $G[D \cup D' \cup V(Q)]$ isomorphic to a weakly induced H_i, choose one, say H, minimizing the number of vertices. To complete the proof, we will now show that H is an induced subgraph of G, in particular, the subgraph of G induced by $V(H)$ is isomorphic to a member of H_i. Let us denote the vertices of H as in Fig. 7 below. Let H' be the subgraph of G induced by $V(H)$.



Figure 7: A weakly induced H_n

Suppose that $H \neq H'$. Then, there is an edge in H' that is not present in H. The only possible edges that can be present in H' but not in H are those connecting one of the vertices x_2, x_3, z_2, z_3 with one of the vertices in the set $\{y_2, \ldots, y_{n-1}\}$. Without loss of generality, assume that x_2 has a neighbor in the set $\{y_2, \ldots, y_{n-1}\}$. Since G is chordal, so is H', and hence if $x_2 \sim y_j$ for some $j \in \{2, \ldots, n-1\}$, then $x_2 \sim x_{j'}$ for all $j' \in \{2, \ldots, j\}$. Let $j \in \{2, \ldots, n-1\}$ be the maximum index such that $x_2 \sim y_j$. If $j \geq 3$, then we can replace H with the graph obtained from the (induced) diamond formed by $\{x_2, y_{j-2}, y_{j-1}, y_j\}$ together with the (induced) path $(y_j, \ldots, y_n)$ and the (induced) diamond $\{y_n, z_1, z_2, z_3\}$. This would result in a weakly induced H_i with a smaller number of vertices as H, contrary to the choice of H. Therefore, $j = 2$. If $x_3 \nsim y_2$, then a smaller weakly induced H_i than H would be obtained by taking the (induced) diamond formed by $\{x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2\}$ together with the (induced) path $(y_2, \ldots, y_n)$ and the (induced) diamond $\{y_n, z_1, z_2, z_3\}$. Therefore, $x_3 \sim y_2$. Since the tips of the diamonds do not have any neighbors on the connecting path, we infer that $x_1 \nsim y_2$. But now, a weakly induced H_i smaller than H can be obtained by taking the (induced) diamond formed by $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, y_2\}$ together with the (induced) path $(y_2, \ldots, y_n)$ and the (induced) diamond $\{y_n, z_1, z_2, z_3\}$. This contradiction shows that we must in fact have $H = H'$ and completes the proof of Case 4.

This completes the proof of Case 7 and with it the proof of Theorem 5.3. □

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Endre Boros, Yves Crama, Vladimir Gurvich, Pinar Heggernes, Haiko Müller, and Vito Vitrih for helpful discussions, and to Dieter Kratsch and Haiko Müller for providing them a copy of paper [40]. The work for this paper was partly done in the framework of a bilateral project between Argentina and Slovenia, financed by the Slovenian Research Agency (BI-AR/15–17–009) and MINCYT-MHEST (SLO/14/09). This work is supported in part by the Slovenian Research Agency (I0-0035, research program P1-0285, research projects N1-0032, J1-5433, J1-6720, J1-6743, and J1-7051).

References

[1] W. Ananchuen, N. Ananchuen, and M. D. Plummer. Connected domination: vertex criticality and matchings. *Util. Math.*, 89:141–159, 2012.

[2] C. Benzaken and P. L. Hammer. Linear separation of dominating sets in graphs. *Ann. Discrete Math.*, 3:1–10, 1978. Advances in Graph Theory (Cambridge Combinatorial Conf., Trinity College, Cambridge, 1977).

[3] C. Berge. *Hypergraphs*, volume 45 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989.

[4] A. Berry, J.-P. Bordat, and O. Cogis. Generating all the minimal separators of a graph. *Internat. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 11(3):397–403, 2000.

[5] A. Berry and R. Pogorelcnik. A simple algorithm to generate the minimal separators and the maximal cliques of a chordal graph. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 111(11):508–511, 2011.

[6] P. Bertolazzi and A. Sassano. An $O(mn)$ algorithm for regular set-covering problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 54:237–247, 1987.

[7] J. Blum, M. Ding, A. Thaeler, and X. Cheng. Connected dominating set in sensor networks and MANETs. In *Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization. Supplement Vol. B*, pages 329–369. Springer, New York, 2005.

[8] E. Boros. Dualization of aligned boolean functions. RUTCOR Research Report, RRR 9-94, 1994.

[9] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, and M. Milanič. 1-Sperner hypergraphs. 2015. arXiv:1510.02438 [math.CO].

[10] V. Bouchitté and I. Todinca. Treewidth and minimum fill-in: grouping the minimal separators. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 31(1):212–232, 2001.

[11] A. Brandstädt, V. B. Le, and J. P. Spinrad. *Graph Classes: A Survey*. SIAM Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and Applications. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1999.

[12] S. Butenko, S. Kahruman-Anderoglu, and O. Ursulenko. On connected domination in unit ball graphs. *Optim. Lett.*, 5(2):195–205, 2011.

[13] L. S. Chandran, A. Das, D. Rajendraprasad, and N. M. Varma. Rainbow connection number and connected dominating sets. *J. Graph Theory*, 71(2):206–218, 2012.

[14] L. S. Chandran and F. Grandoni. A linear time algorithm to list the minimal separators of chordal graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 306(3):351–358, 2006.

[15] N. Chiarelli and M. Milanič. Linear separation of total dominating sets in graphs. In *Proc. 39th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG 2013)*, pages 165–176, 2013.

[16] N. Chiarelli and M. Milanič. Total domishold graphs: a generalization of threshold graphs, with connections to threshold hypergraphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 179:1–12, 2014.

[17] N. Chiarelli and M. Milanič. Linear separation of connected dominating sets in graphs (extended abstract). In: International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Mathematics: 6–8 January 2014, Fort Lauderdale, FL. Fort Lauderdale, 2014. Available at https://www.cs.uic.edu/Isaim2014/.

[18] C. K. Chow. Boolean functions realizable with single threshold devices. *Proc. IRE*, 49:370–371, 1961.

[19] V. Chvátal and P. L. Hammer. Aggregation of inequalities in integer programming. In *Studies in Integer Programming (Proc. Workshop, Bonn, 1975)*, pages 145–162. Ann. of Discrete Math., Vol. 1. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977.

[20] Y. Crama. Dualization of regular boolean functions. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 16(1):79–85, 1987.

[21] Y. Crama and P. L. Hammer. *Boolean Functions: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*, volume 142 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.

[22] H. N. de Ridder et al. Information System on Graph Classes and their Inclusions (ISGCI). `http://www.graphclasses.org`, 2001–2014. Online; accessed 30-August-2016.

[23] I. Dinur and D. Steurer. Analytical approach to parallel repetition. In *STOC'14—Proceedings of the 2014 ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 624–633. ACM, New York, 2014.

[24] G. A. Dirac. On rigid circuit graphs. *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg*, 25:71–76, 1961.

[25] D.-Z. Du and P.-J. Wan. *Connected Dominating Set: Theory and Applications*, volume 77 of *Springer Optimization and Its Applications*. Springer, New York, 2013.

[26] W. Duckworth and B. Mans. Connected domination of regular graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 309(8):2305–2322, 2009.

[27] T. Eiter, K. Makino, and G. Gottlob. Computational aspects of monotone dualization: a brief survey. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 156(11):2035–2049, 2008.

[28] C. C. Elgot. Truth functions realizable by single threshold organs. In *in: IEEE Symposium on Switching Circuit Theory and Logical Design*, pages 225–245. IEEE Computer Society, 1960.

[29] S. Foldes and P. L. Hammer. Split graphs. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Southeastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge, La., 1977)*, pages 311–315. Congressus Numerantium, No. XIX. Utilitas Math., Winnipeg, Man., 1977.

[30] F. V. Fomin, F. Grandoni, and D. Kratsch. Solving connected dominating set faster than 2^n. *Algorithmica*, 52(2):153–166, 2008.

[31] I. J. Gabelman. *The Functional Behavior of Majority (Threshold) Elements*. Department of Electrical Engineering, Syracuse University, NY, 1961. Ph.D. Dissertation.

[32] M. C. Golumbic. Trivially perfect graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 24(1):105–107, 1978.

[33] M. C. Golumbic. *Algorithmic Graph Theory and Perfect Graphs*, volume 57 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, second edition, 2004.

[34] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater. *Domination in Graphs: Advanced Topics*, volume 209 of *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1998.

[35] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater. *Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs*, volume 208 of *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1998.

[36] M. M. Kanté, V. Limouzy, A. Mary, and L. Nourine. On the enumeration of minimal dominating sets and related notions. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 28(4):1916–1929, 2014.

[37] H. Karami, S. M. Sheikholeslami, A. Khodkar, and D. B. West. Connected domination number of a graph and its complement. *Graphs Combin.*, 28(1):123–131, 2012.

[38] N. Karmarkar. A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming. *Combinatorica*, 4(4):373–395, 1984.

[39] C. J. Klivans. Threshold graphs, shifted complexes, and graphical complexes. *Discrete Math.*, 307(21):2591–2597, 2007.

[40] T. Kloks, H. Bodlaender, H. Müller, and D. Kratsch. Computing treewidth and minimum fill-in: all you need are the minimal separators. In *Algorithms—ESA '93 (Bad Honnef, 1993)*, volume 726 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 260–271. Springer, Berlin, 1993.

[41] T. Kloks and D. Kratsch. Listing all minimal separators of a graph. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 27(3):605–613, 1998.

[42] P. S. Kumar and C. E. Veni Madhavan. Minimal vertex separators of chordal graphs. *Discrete Applied Math.*, 89(1-3):155–168, 1998.

[43] V. E. Levit, M. Milanič, and D. Tankus. On the recognition of k-equistable graphs. In *Proc. 38th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG 2012)*, pages 286–296, 2012.

[44] N. V. R. Mahadev and U. N. Peled. *Threshold Graphs and Related Topics*, volume 56 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1995.

[45] N. V. R. Mahadev, U. N. Peled, and F. Sun. Equistable graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 18(3):281–299, 1994.

[46] D. Michalak. Hereditarily dominated graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 307(7-8):952–957, 2007.

[47] M. Milanič, J. Orlin, and G. Rudolf. Complexity results for equistable graphs and related classes. *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 188:359–370, 2011.

[48] P. Montealegre and I. Todinca. On Distance-d Independent Set and other problems in graphs with "few" minimal separators. In *Proc. 42nd International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG 2016)*, 2016 (to appear).

[49] S. Muroga. *Threshold Logic and its Applications*. Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], New York-London-Sydney, 1971.

[50] C. Payan. A class of threshold and domishold graphs: equistable and equidominating graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 29(1):47–52, 1980.

[51] U. N. Peled and B. Simeone. Polynomial-time algorithms for regular set-covering and threshold synthesis. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 12(1):57–69, 1985.

[52] U. N. Peled and B. Simeone. An $O(nm)$-time algorithm for computing the dual of a regular Boolean function. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 49(1-3):309–323, 1994.

[53] N. Pržulj, D. G. Corneil, and E. Köhler. Hereditary dominating pair graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 134(1-3):239–261, 2004.

[54] J. Reiterman, V. Rödl, E. Šiňajová, and M. Tůma. Threshold hypergraphs. *Discrete Math.*, 54(2):193–200, 1985.

[55] D. J. Rose, R. E. Tarjan, and G. S. Lueker. Algorithmic aspects of vertex elimination on graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 5(2):266–283, 1976.

[56] O. Schaudt. A note on connected dominating sets of distance-hereditary graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 160(9):1394–1398, 2012.

[57] O. Schaudt. On graphs for which the connected domination number is at most the total domination number. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 160(7-8):1281–1284, 2012.

[58] O. Schaudt and R. Schrader. The complexity of connected dominating sets and total dominating sets with specified induced subgraphs. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 112(24):953–957, 2012.

[59] H. Shen and W. Liang. Efficient enumeration of all minimal separators in a graph. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 180(1-2):169–180, 1997.

[60] D. B. West. *Introduction to Graph Theory.* Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River (N. J.), 2001.

[61] J. Wu and H. Li. A dominating-set-based routing scheme in ad hoc wireless networks. *Telecommunication Systems*, 18(1):13–36, 2001.

[62] J.-H. Yan, J.-J. Chen, and G. J. Chang. Quasi-threshold graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 69(3):247–255, 1996.